

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to Federal contribution for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2478. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred H. Gibbons, Chief Clerk, Hugo, Okla., Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 2480. A bill for the relief of Ulma B. Riggs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2481. A bill for the relief of Rokutchi Tahara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2482. A bill for the relief of John Ritter Dunham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 2483. A bill for the relief of Emma Armstrong for loss sustained in post-office burglary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2484. A bill to authorize the payment of certain sums to jobbers in connection with their logging of timber for the Menominee Indians on the Menominee Reservation during the logging season 1934-35, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2485. A bill for the relief of Pawel Prokopeni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2486. A bill for the relief of Zdzislaw Moskala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2487. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw H. Mayak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2488. A bill for the relief of Polivio S. Aresta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2489. A bill for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2490. A bill for the relief of J. V. Crain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

171. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their good offices to secure prompt passage of the George bill, so-called, or a similar measure, to restore to the veterans of World War II the benefit rights to which they are justly entitled; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

172. Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States with relation to the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

173. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of Winslow Grange, No. 320, Winslow, Maine, favoring an allocation of sugar for home canning in 1947 to the end that home canning will not be unduly curtailed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

174. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of Reserve officers, members of Odessa (Tex.) Chapter, ROA, urging passage of legislation providing for plan of universal military training whereby each young man of this country shall have 4 months of basic training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

175. Also, petition of Reserve officers, of Odessa, Tex., urging legislation providing amendment to law for uniform allowance for newly commissioned officers, for equalization of military leave for civil-service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

176. Also, petition of Reserve officers, of Odessa, Tex., urging legislation providing inactive-duty pay for Reserve officers of the armed forces, disability retirement pay for Reserve and other civilian component personnel ordered to active duty for periods of less than 30 days, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

177. Also, petition of Reserve officers, of Odessa, Tex., urging legislation providing for a single Department of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

178. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Legislative Committee on Educational Survey, Baton Rouge, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the bill S. 472; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou Father of all mercies, whose spirit mingles with ours as sunshine with the air, we wait at the altar of supplication, deeply conscious that we are the children of time and sense. In the shadow of Thy wings, love and truth go before Thy face. We rejoice that Thou art our help and strength, and pray Thee to make us restless and weary of the things we see, striving for that which transcends human attainment.

As we meditate on the world's desperate condition, attend unto our spirits, O Lord, lest our thralldom be tragically complete. O clarify our vision, gird us for labor, and grant that in all honor we may measure up to the demands of an expectant public. Forbid that we should lose their respect by vacillation or by compromising our traditions. Hear our humble prayer, O Lord, for Thy name's sake, and grant us Thy peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a newspaper article and an editorial.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include a resolution on the St. Lawrence seaway.

STRIKES AND VIOLENCE

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past 5 weeks the Committee on Education and Labor has been holding hearings in an effort to find as adequate a solution as possible to labor unrest. We have heard unbelievable testimony concerning violence in the conduct of strikes throughout the Nation. Workers have been beaten up, their families and homes molested, in practically every large city in the Nation. It is the same pattern, whether in Detroit, Chicago, or New York. In Pittsburgh we heard evidence that explosive bombs have been hurled at business establishments and fires started. Witnesses from Philadelphia came before the committee and testified that they were afraid of their lives because they testified before the Committee on Labor. This situation is not confined to large cities. As an example, and there are many similar cases, there is the case of violence involved at the Norman Dairies in New Canaan, Conn., a community of 6,500 population. The drivers of two trucks owned by this small dairy were beaten up and left unconscious by the roadside. One of them, incidentally, was a returned veteran of the Navy Air Corps. These victims had the courage to swear out warrants against their assailants, and, although that was 14 months ago, the case still has to come to trial.

Only last Saturday a representative of the AFL carpenters' union who is involved in the 2-year-old jurisdictional strike in the movie industry in Hollywood testified that he felt his life was in danger from the very moment he left our committee room.

About 2 weeks ago, George P. McNear, Jr., appeared before our committee to testify relative to the strike on the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad. After he testified, he indicated to me personally that he felt he might be threatened and that attempts might be made to intimidate him. Later, representatives of the unions involved in that strike also testified before this committee.

They charged Mr. McNear, among other things, with lack of any knowledge of railroading and, at least by intimation and inference, impugned his patriotism. To these charges Mr. McNear did not see fit to reply.

He could have stated that he learned railroading under Mr. Loree, famed American railroader. He could have stated that he worked on track gangs on the New York Central in 1916 and early 1917 in order to fit himself for an important post in organizing French railroads in World War I.

And as to his patriotism, he could have told the story of his only son in World War II. That son, in the Navy, wrote to

his father in the fall of 1944 that he had his orders to return to the States.

But—

Said young McNear—

I have been given special training to fit me for a big job that is coming up. I feel I should stay here and see it through. What do you think, dad?

And his father wrote back:

Son, you don't desert the boat in the middle of the stream; you see it through to the far shore.

Young McNear voluntarily "saw it through." Today he lies buried in New Guinea.

Today his father lies dead in Peoria, victim of an assassin's bullet fired from a speeding automobile as the elder McNear took his nightly walk near his home.

He did not desert the boat in the middle of the stream, but chose to try and see it through to the far shore.

It would seem that this instance, plus the bombings in Pittsburgh, plus the shootings in Hollywood, plus innumerable like incidents growing out of labor wars in this country puts the question squarely to the Eightieth Congress of the Republic of the United States.

Will this Congress desert the boat in the middle of the stream or, regardless of how strong the personal dangers involved, see the boat through to the far shore of industrial peace in this country.

I believe we have a duty to do more than legislate. As chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I am asking the Attorney General of the United States to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to go into the McNear slaying immediately and with all the facilities that great agency has at its disposal. In my opinion, there is a direct connection between the slaying of Mr. McNear and his testimony before our committee. It is significant that only yesterday I received a letter from Mr. McNear in which he stated:

I would be glad to return to Washington for further questioning regarding my additional statement, if the committee should so desire.

Mr. Speaker, we want and we will do everything in our power to correct situations such as this. However, this tragedy, which culminates a series of reports of violence throughout the Nation, is the primary responsibility of the local law-enforcement agents throughout the Nation. I rise to ask the question: What has happened to law and order in this Nation? When are our governors, our county sheriffs, our local officials, our local police departments going to display the intestinal fortitude to adequately deal with these situations?

It is high time that all of those entrusted with the enforcement of law and order wake up to their responsibility and make it clear that no individual or no group, however powerful, is immune from the laws of the land.

FIVE-YEAR LEVEL PREMIUM TERM POLICIES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following

privileged resolution (H. Res. 138, Rept. No. 117), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 1327) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies for another 5-year period. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMANENT NURSE CORPS OF THE ARMY AND THE NAVY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 139, Rept. No. 118), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1943, a bill to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SUSPENDING CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 140, Rept. No. 119), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on

the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DECLARATION OF RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New Hampshire Morning Union entitled "Arms for Greece."

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution adopted by the Protestant Council of the city of New York.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a letter of a constituent.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in this morning's Times-Herald.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem by L. V. Hegwood, of Tacoma, Wash., formerly of his home county.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Pink Snow Over Russia."

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Times by Mr. Joseph Abbott, president of the American Sugar Refining Co.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

GREAT BRITAIN SHOULD NOT BE A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON PALESTINE, AS SUGGESTED BY SECRETARY GENERAL TRYGVE LIE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, has suggested the appointment of an advisory committee to study the Palestine situation and to submit recommendations to a regular or special meeting of the General Assembly. Mr. Lie has been sounding out the Big Five.

The United States has properly refused consent or the ground that Great

Britain has not submitted a clear-cut proposal on Palestine.

The United States must also object to the inclusion of Great Britain as a member of such committee. Mr. Lie has stated categorically that this committee will be composed of the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, France, and China, which are the permanent members of the Security Council, together with Brazil, Czechoslovakia, and Sweden.

The inclusion of Great Britain would be a grave mistake. She is a party in interest and if included she would be acting as a judge in her own cause. Great Britain must be excluded. Common decency and justice require it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution adopted by the Washington Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a newspaper article appearing in the Boston Post and in the other an editorial that appeared in the Irish World.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Anne O'Hare McCormick.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in relation to a tax reduction bill he introduced today.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was given permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$159.75. I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR ALL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the present Social Security Act is a worthy step toward providing some measure of financial independence and peace of mind for the men and women who made this country, as they reach that well-earned period of rest from their labors that we call "the sunset of life."

Perhaps we delayed too long in passing such legislation, and that is the reason why the present law is unbalanced, extending coverage to some, while denying it to others.

No one of us, with the tragic memories of boom-and-bust still in his mind, can

rest content until he makes every effort to protect all of our people from any possibility that they may have to endure such a ravaging experience again.

We must have full employment, but more than that, we must establish a bedrock of security for those who, because of their age, are cast aside by our economic system.

To be truly democratic, we must have no bewildering and heart-breaking poverty for the aged in this rich land of ours.

Social security for all on a self-sustaining basis can be won by support of the bill which I have introduced. It will provide benefits on a minimum-maximum range of \$60 to \$75 per month for every retired citizen 60 years of age and over. The revenue to support this law will come from a tax of 2 percent upon the gross dollar value of all business transactions conducted for profit within the United States. For the purposes of this act, wages, salaries, and commissions shall be considered as transactions.

We have recently emerged from a war which was a struggle, in part, between the "have" and the "have-not" nations. Apart from humanitarian considerations, let us soberly ask ourselves, "Can we afford to let this situation develop within our Nation?"

Industry itself has come to realize that its production and its profits are dependent upon the widest possible distribution of purchasing power.

The aged, too, are consumers. They, also, must have the wherewith to buy, when they are no longer wanted in the labor force.

Social security for all will strengthen our national security.

LEGISLATION TO CORRECT INEQUITIES IN PUBLIC LAW 134

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, by inadvertence when Public Law 134 was passed by the Congress, the three lower salary employees of the postal service were deprived of the benefits of the meritorious grades provided in that act.

I am certain it was not the intent of Congress to discriminate against these low-salaried employees. For that reason, I conclude it was an oversight that they were omitted from the provisions and benefits of Public Law 134, as amended.

The classes of postal employees to which I refer are: Elevator mechanics helpers, telephone operators, firemen and firemen's helpers, gardeners, guards, elevator operators, window cleaners, charworkers, messengers, and manual laborers; a total of some 13,000 employees throughout the entire postal service.

To rectify this apparent discrimination against these lower salaried employees in our postal service, I am introducing a bill to amend Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, so as to give these employees the benefits of the meritorious grades, thus giving them equal consideration with other postal employees.

I am informed this bill has the approval of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget. The bill will not affect the 1947-48 budget, inasmuch as its effective date will be July 1, 1949.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the fact that the House may be in session on subsequent days during the week a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which is investigating racketeering may be permitted to hold hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is that for today?

Mr. HOFFMAN. For Thursday and Friday.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know what will be under consideration in the House on Thursday and Friday, Mr. Speaker. I announced the other day that when bills were being considered under the 5-minute rule I thought committees should not sit. Until we determine what will be the program on Thursday and Friday, I must object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about Friday?

Mr. RAYBURN. I said Thursday and Friday. We can wait and see, I think.

COMMUNISM IN THE GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, at least some of us Members of the Congress are getting tired of seeing and hearing the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] rise on this floor and attack Great Britain, a friendly country, for resisting what we consider a Communist-front movement in Palestine known as the Zionist movement.

Now we are being asked to challenge Communism in Greece. I for one have been in favor of challenging communism in this country all the time; but I want to begin at home and drive communism out of every department of this Government first.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] complained a while ago of Communists threatening the witnesses that come before his committee, and told of one of those witnesses being murdered last night. I say, bring out your bill and let us pass some legislation to put a stop to these outrages.

Another thing, I should like to wake up the Department of Justice. I am for cleaning house and fumigating every department of this Government. The Committee on Un-American Activities wrote letters to the Department of Justice 2 weeks ago for information that we needed and to this date we have not even received a reply.

Mr. Speaker, we are coming to a great show-down with atheistic communism

throughout the world; but while we are cleaning the other fellow's house let us clean our own and drive these subversive elements from every branch of our Government, from our educational institutions, from labor unions, and from every other phase of American life. Let us save America for Americans. This is the last stand of civilization as we know it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a number of letters and telegrams—and I know some of the other Members of the House have also—with respect to the fact that Congress is slow in passing legislation. They mention particularly the matter of labor.

We of the Committee on Education and Labor have been working hard for 5 weeks from morning until night, sometimes from 9 in the morning to 7 o'clock at night, to give everyone a fair hearing, including both labor and management. During that time, while the Communist end has crept into our hearings, we find that the difficulties seem to rise mainly in the question of jurisdictional strikes. They appear to be paralyzing our Nation. We ask the people of the United States and the Congress, both the House and Senate, to give us a little time, because we are going to bring out a bill very shortly. When we do, I think that you will find that it will be fair to both management and labor.

THE FOREIGN SITUATION

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 1941, a New York Times editorial carried this sentence:

If China is to be saved, with our help, from Japanese and Axis control its embattled leaders will have to forget their divergent doctrinal objectives and settle their present dispute peaceably.

That was six long years ago. Since then billions of dollars of American money and the blood of American youths have been poured into Asia in an effort to "save China."

Now the same people who maneuvered America into ghastly failure in China are at it again. They want us to go into Greece in the same fashion. What are these schemes for? The Communists could not figure out a surer way to destroy America than the road the internationalists have taken us on for 6 years—with Greece now proposed as the next milepost. Our bewildered leaders, whose policies have resulted in such complete failure, now play into Stalin's hands when they are sucked into overextending our declining strength around the world.

TAKING CARE OF THE OLD FOLKS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I know, and all of us know, that many important matters are going to confront us during this session of the Congress. But I hope we do not forget our old folks.

I have recently introduced a bill, H. R. 2410. I hope I shall have the opportunity to call its provisions to your attention a little later. It is simple. I believe it is workable. But whether my bill is passed or whether some other bill is passed, definitely, gentlemen, definitely we must take a step forward to protect and provide for our own old folks. It is a tragedy the way it has been going. It is all mixed up and a jumbled-up affair. It is not just. It is not simple. It is not American. I hope we will give our attention to it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

THE FOREIGN SITUATION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I am asking for this opportunity to correct several serious misstatements which are being spread throughout the country. The Republican Party is being charged with all the difficulties through which our country is passing.

Let us call a spade a spade. The major European problems which afflict us today are the direct products of the secret agreements secretly arrived at during the war. For reasons unknown to the American people and even to those in the State Department who should have known, European spheres of influence were carved out at the major conferences of Russia, Great Britain, and our country. Russia was given control over the whole of central and western Europe. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and the Balkans were read out of western Europe. Our own country was to be content with its usual idealistic goose egg.

The chickens are now coming home to roost. We shall pay and pay heavily for the next generation for this foreign policy. But let the country know and let it know in unmistakable terms that this legacy is our heritage from the Democratic Party.

We Republicans are simply resuming our historic role. Here at home and overseas, we are pulling the Democratic chestnuts out of the international and national fires.

STRONG ARMY AND NAVY

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the same elements in this House who were responsible for the unpreparedness of the country, who failed to give full support to the United States foreign policy, and who would today emasculate the Army and the Navy are the ones who are crying, "Get rough with Russia," and complaining about the actions of the State Department.

The American people know it is impossible to get tough with Russia or any other foreign nation and have a strong, vigorous diplomatic policy unless we have a large Army and a large Navy. Those eastern European nations fear nothing but force, and there can be no diplomatic success unless the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle insist that we have a strong Army and Navy to back up our State Department.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial in which is contained a poem written by James Patrick McGovern.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the American Legion Bulletin about this so-called AVC and this man Carlson, this slimy little Communist, who is writing books about America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1968) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will opportunity be afforded for discussion of the conference report before the previous question is put?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1968) making appropriations to supply

urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$136,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"OFFICE OF TEMPORARY CONTROLS

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for the Office of Price Administration transferred by Executive Order 9809 of December 12, 1946, to the Office of Temporary Controls, \$7,051,752, to be available for the payment of terminal leave only: *Provided*, That it is the intent of the Congress that the funds heretofore and herein appropriated shall include all expenses incident to the closing and liquidation of the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Temporary Controls by June 30, 1947."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Salaries and expenses, Office of Price Administration functions, Office of Temporary Controls, 1947, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That the Office of Price Administration shall be discontinued and its affairs shall be entirely liquidated not later than June 30, 1947."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN D. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1968) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation

of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment No. 1: Adds the word "Senate" as a subtitle to the bill.

Amendments No. 2 and No. 3: Appropriates gratuities to the widows of two deceased Senators, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$1,000 for additional clerical assistance in the Senate Disbursing Office, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Allows the Senate Committee on Appropriations to employ a consultant at not to exceed \$35 per day, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$275 to pay compensation to a former Senate employee for services rendered, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$267 for increasing the salary of one clerk under the Office of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$3,600 to provide for the employment of six additional telephone operators on the Capitol switchboard, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$2,174.40 for the rent of additional warehouse space, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$10,600 for reimbursement to the District of Columbia to provide for the education of congressional pages and Supreme Court pages, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$50,000 for salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$7,500 to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$32,000 for alterations and improvements in the Senate Office Building, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$136,500 for salaries and expenses, Office of Defense Transportation, instead of \$130,000 as proposed by the House and \$143,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$7,051,752 to the Office of Price Administration to be available for the payment of terminal leave only, with a proviso directing the payment out of current funds of all expenses incident to the closing and liquidation of the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Temporary Controls by June 30, 1947, instead of an appropriation of \$7,491,815 for general administration and liquidation of the Office of Price Administration, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$3,000,000 for the employees' compensation fund, Federal Security Agency, instead of \$3,474,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$165,000,000 as proposed by the Senate to the Veterans' Administration for "administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services," instead of \$135,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$3,100,000 to the Treasury Department for Division of Disbursement, salaries and expenses, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,520,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—RESCISSIONS

Amendment No. 19: Provides that the Civilian Production Administration "shall be entirely liquidated" by June 30, 1947, as proposed by the Senate, instead of being "placed in liquidation" by that date, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Rescinds \$2,000,000 of Office of Price Administration funds instead of \$9,000,000 as proposed by the House and none as proposed by the Senate, with the

proviso that the Office of Price Administration shall be entirely liquidated not later than June 30, 1947.

Amendment No. 21: Rescinds \$44,000 from salaries and expenses, Economic Stabilization, Office of War Mobilization and Reconstruction functions, Office of Temporary Controls, and \$16,000 from salaries and expenses, guaranteed annual wage plans, Office of War Mobilization and Reconstruction functions, Office of Temporary Controls, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$60,000 from salaries and expenses, Office of War Mobilization and Reconstruction, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Eliminates a proposed rescission of \$16,693.29 for military and naval compensation, Veterans' Administration, as proposed by the Senate, inasmuch as such sum has previously been recovered by the Treasury.

Amendment No. 23: Rescinds \$2,101,972 on account of access roads, Public Roads Administration, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,897,030 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24: Rescinds \$282,481 on account of strategic highway network, Public Roads Administration, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$278,158 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25: Rescinds \$1,280,000 from Treasury Department, Bureau of Accounts, emergency relief, liquidation fund, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26: Rescinds \$1,323,480.02 from Treasury Department, Bureau of Federal Supply, working capital fund, duplicating services, Procurement Division, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,483,480.02 as proposed by the House.

JOHN TABER,
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report carries some emergency items, that is, items that are necessary to meet the pay rolls of the different units of the Government and some of the obligations of the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration still has not been finished up and we will need further hearings to cover what is necessary on other items a little later.

With the exception of certain items relating to the Senate, items to which attention will be called later, the items in the bill relate to the OPA. Here we have agreed with the Senate upon an item of \$7,051,752, which is the exact amount they claim is required for the terminal leave to which the OPA employees will be entitled.

We have reduced the cut in the rescission end of the bill from \$9,000,000 to \$2,000,000, and in that we have made available to the OPA a very considerable sum of money, a sum of money which will unquestionably, if they have honest administration—which they have not had so far—give them plenty of money with which to operate needed activities. They have a pay roll in Washington of 914 people drawing upward of \$4,000, and to perform their functions they need no more than a hundred. They have 850 drawing under \$4,000, and they need no more than a hundred. Out in the field they have an enormous number still left

on law enforcement with nothing left except cases which should have been disposed of long, long ago or should have been turned over to the Department of Justice. You understand that these people do not try the cases. The cases, if any, are tried by the Department of Justice. These people would be able to maintain at least 5,000 people on the pay roll with what money we left, in my opinion, which is far more than they need to do a good job.

There is no question in my opinion but what this outfit should be wound up, but there is very serious question that the language goes far enough to actually accomplish that end. I hope it does. There is a provision on page 6 of the bill that it is the intent of Congress that the funds heretofore and herein appropriated shall include all expenses incident to the closing and liquidation of the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Temporary Controls by June 30, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have been extraordinarily liberal in providing funds for this agency. When they finished up their work, with the exception of sugar rationing, rent control, and one or two other small items, about the 7th of November, they had upward of 30,000 employees. They did not keep faith with the Congress and get rid of them promptly, as they should have, but kept most of them on until the 1st of December before giving them terminal notice. Then they spent a very large sum of money in December, and they have spent enormous sums since that time. For instance, they had on their rolls a week or two ago 122 economists in their Washington office, 147 accountants, 187 analysts, 168 attorneys, and an enormous number of other officers drawing large salaries. They had 64 people with an average salary of about \$8,000 a year acting as a committee to obtain employment for the employees, with nothing else to do. They had a very large sum of money set up for a historical project with an enormous number of people working and doing a lot of other things on a much more elaborate scale than they could possibly be entitled to. These people I have listed had no substantial job on their hands that they needed to do. There is no question but what if they had managed the thing honestly they could have performed every single function that is up to them to perform.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Amendment No. 20, to which both the House and Senate agreed, specifically provides for the entire liquidation of the Office of Price Control on or before June 30; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. I wish it did, but I am afraid it does not.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It says so specifically in the report the gentleman filed.

Mr. TABER. It does not. I read it to the gentleman, and if he had been listening he would have known that that is not correct.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have before me the printed language and may I call it to the gentleman's attention? It is printed in the Record, at page 1910. Amendment No. 20 "rescinds \$2,000,000 of Office of Price Administration funds instead of \$9,000,000 as proposed by the House and none as proposed by the Senate, with the proviso that the Office of Price Administration shall be entirely liquidated not later than June 30, 1947."

Mr. TABER. That is right. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That means the end of rent control unless other legislation is enacted by this Congress; is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. Well, the Office of Price Administration and its controls would expire at that time unless there was other legislation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I know, but the report provides for the liquidation of that office in its entirety.

Mr. TABER. Yes, that is right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That means, incidentally, also, that the remaining funds not rescinded here are for liquidating purposes, and primarily for liquidating purposes.

Mr. TABER. Certainly, they are partly for liquidating purposes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And that means liquidating the enforcement of rent control.

Mr. TABER. They have been getting it. The people can enforce their own rent control by the triple damage provision, in part, and they can do it much more effectively than it has been done, and they do not need these people who have done nothing but mess up the situation further.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am not arguing with the gentleman as to the merits of continuing rent control. That is something on which we disagree. I am a firm believer in rent control. What I am trying to get agreement on from the gentleman is the effect of that amendment No. 20, which has been agreed to by both the House and the Senate conferees.

Mr. TABER. The effect of it is this—

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I complete my statement, please? In view of the language calling for liquidation in its entirety, the gentleman must necessarily agree that that also calls for the liquidation of rent control.

Mr. TABER. Only if the Congress does not pass an act extending it, because rent control is not dependent on the continuance of the OPA. It is dependent upon the statute. There is no statute that runs beyond that time. The effect of this language is this, that it would require these people to take care of their terminal leave and their cleaning-up activities by the 30th of June. If the Congress desires to change the law and extend rent control after that date, that would be a matter for consideration at that time as to whether any further appropriations or funds should be made available for any governmental agency to continue to operate their functions.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on this side of the aisle have signed this report with considerable doubt and some reluctance. But there is so much that is carried in the bill that is necessary and essential that it overshadows the questionable provisions to the extent that we are going along. We go, however, with reservations contingent upon assurances of the prompt enactment of legislation to provide for continuation of essential services discontinued in the pending bill.

Perhaps the principal item of interest in the bill is the precipitous liquidation of OPA. Before discussing the merits of the proposition, it may be noted in passing, Mr. Speaker, that this liquidation is effected through a legislative rider. I think there was no evil in our legislative machinery which was so decried and so castigated in the months of debate on the reorganization bill as the practice of legislating through riders on appropriation bills. By common consent it was branded as reprehensible, as the last resort of parliamentary depravity, and one of the outstanding provisions of the bill, one of the salient arguments in favor of the passage of the streamlined Reorganization Act in the House, was that its enactment would eliminate, once and for all, this unholy practice of legislating on appropriation bills.

The Reorganization Act was duly passed and is now in force, and yet we have here in the pending conference report provision for a drastic change in our economic machinery, to be effected through a rider on an appropriation bill. Thus the far-famed and highly publicized reorganization bill is, as usual, being honored in the breach through total disregard of one of its most cherished provisions.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. On yesterday we were discussing the bill providing funds for rural free delivery. I pointed out that the Post Office Department was complaining that although these extensions in the various communities throughout the country are being approved they do not have the funds to provide the service. Last night I took this proposition up with the Post Office Department and was informed that this proposition did not apply to the next fiscal year, but it is a deficiency appropriation that is needed now. May I ask the gentleman if there is anything provided in this bill to take care of those extensions of rural free delivery routes throughout the country, and if not, I should like to know what the prospects are for an additional deficiency bill. Can the gentleman give me that information or can the gentleman from New York answer the question?

Mr. TABER. There is nothing with reference to the Post Office Department that I remember of in this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. May I ask the gentleman from New York when he contemplates bringing out another deficiency bill?

Mr. TABER. There are items under hearing at the present time. The bill probably will be marked up either late this week or the first of next week. I cannot tell yet about that.

Mr. RANKIN. What I mentioned then, I will say to the gentleman from New York, is the fact that large numbers of rural free delivery routes have been extended, probably in almost every State of the Union, but they need a deficiency appropriation in order to put those extensions into effect. It seems to me that while we are taking care of everybody from Tokyo to Timbuktu we might look out for our farmers and see that those boys who were drafted into the service to fight the battle of the world at least are provided with mail service, along with other American citizens.

Mr. TABER. May I say to the gentleman that my attention was not called to that prior to this time, nor has the Post Office Department told me that that condition existed. But just as quickly as the committee is able, I will be glad to have hearings and I will notify the gentleman and give him an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as well as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. There has been a great deal of interest in the school-lunch program. Of course, the budget recommendation is not before the committee as yet, but, as I understand, unless there is a deficiency appropriation, the program for the present fiscal year will expire on March 31. Would the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] advise me whether or not he favors a deficiency appropriation to continue this program until June 30?

Mr. TABER. The understanding was when the bill was passed and the appropriation provided that that would be all of the Federal contribution for the fiscal year. Personally, I do not think the Federal Government is in as good a position to pay for these lunches as the State governments and the municipalities. Therefore, I feel the State governments and municipalities should carry the burden. That is my personal position. I do not mean by that that if the bill should be passed increasing the authorization and the budget estimate come up that I would not afford the people interested a hearing.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words the gentleman himself is opposed to the program?

Mr. TABER. I feel that it is a responsibility that can be met much more cheaply by the localities and that they are much better able to bear the burden than the Federal Government is at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the gentleman himself is opposed to the program?

Mr. TABER. I am, personally.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that of the \$75,000,000 appropriated, which I think was the amount, \$10,000,-

000 was for the purchase of equipment which, of course, we provided for in the authorization bill which passed the House last year. I understand that \$10,000,000 will probably carry the program until the end of June. I honestly disagree with my friend. I think the program serves a very useful purpose. The States are cooperating. Every State had to make their contribution, and certainly the contribution of some States is much more than that of the Federal Government.

Of course, the school-lunch program has been a means or source of invaluable assistance to our farmers, particularly with reference to moving their surplus crops.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, supplementing what has been said with reference to the school-lunch program, it is to be regretted that provision is not being made for a deficiency appropriation to continue the program for the remainder of the fiscal year. At the time of the establishment of this program, the assurance was given, or at least implied that the Federal Government, having initiated the service, would continue its support. Of course, all of us realize that if left to the States, or local units, neither is in position to provide all the funds needed for the complete administration of the program. The only hope of its maintenance is the continuance of Federal cooperation as heretofore. For us to abandon it at this critical time is not only to leave the impression that we are withdrawing assurance by the Federal Government and accepted by the States. But the abandoned program also leaves a large amount of equipment and specially designed and adapted facilities which has been provided in schools distributed throughout the country which cannot be utilized and which—unless it can be used in the school-lunch program—must necessarily be wasted.

Mr. Speaker, we are making large appropriations at this time for livestock. International cooperation for control of foot-and-mouth disease and hog cholera are being amply financed. Surely we can do something for the greatest crop in America, the children—in seeing that they are protected from a recurrence of conditions which, during the war, resulted in the rejection of a large percentage of our young men, due to anemia and undernourishment in their childhood years.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I subscribe to the fine sentiments which the gentleman has just indicated with reference to the school-lunch program. I think the Congress has, at least to some extent, encouraged the States to overspend. In the past when they have overspent we have made up the deficiency as we did last year. I understand we appropriated \$15,000,000 additional last year to make up the deficit. So I say we have encouraged the

States to overspend in some respects, and I think we should continue this program.

Mr. CANNON. There has been a tacit understanding that, having initiated this program, the Federal Government would continue it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman heartily in the statement he has made. When I supported the move for eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, as I did, I did not do that with the idea that I would block a better effort which we have heretofore put forth for the children of America.

Mr. CANNON. There is no reason why we should not take care of the health of both the livestock and the children.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. I wish to bring to the attention of the gentleman the fact that the cost of living to the school children has increased as it has to other people.

This has overtaken this school-lunch program, making it true that they will have to abandon it in this month unless the Federal Government supplements its former appropriations. It is a condition that has been brought about. The facilities may be used to carry it on, but it will be only for those who are able to pay for their lunches, and the others will get none. That is the situation.

Mr. CANNON. Experience has demonstrated that even the children from the wealthiest homes have shown immediate improvement in physique and in scholarship as a result of this program. I trust the Committee on Appropriations will relent and agree to continue the program as heretofore.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact, as has been stated, that due to the increased cost of living, especially the cost of milk that goes into these school lunches, has brought about a situation where there is not sufficient funds for the program to be continued? Can the gentleman tell me who is responsible for the increased cost and for the shortage that now exists?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I do not know whether this is a private conversation or whether the rest of the House is involved in what is being said or not. I cannot hear what is being said. It seems to me we should know.

Mr. SABATH. I am pleased that the gentleman is interested in what I started to say and I hope he will take an interest in what I shall say.

Is it not true that destruction of OPA by the Republican party has brought about a 50-percent increase in the cost of living in only 6 months, and has increased the burden of the cost of school lunches to a point where the States and municipalities cannot carry it alone?

We must make some provision for these children.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], has offered criticism because I have continuously drawn attention to the sharp increase in living costs, and especially of food items, especially the rapid spiral since the November elections.

Nevertheless, he must admit that the school-lunch program was originally created to help the farmers. There were vast surpluses in danger of rotting in the granaries, and the people did not have the money to buy them. The school-lunch program was designed by a Democratic administration to bring the cash from the cities and the crops of the farmers together, and help agriculture. Now farm prices are at the highest point in all history, and farmers for the first time are getting 120 percent of parity for their produce, and the plight of poor children who need the noontime lunches at reduced prices—not charity—is no concern of the gentlemen from the rich and prospering farm areas.

To deny this appropriation so desperately needed to continue the school-lunch program is indeed false economy, as is the elimination of appropriations for rent and sugar controls. We shall pay for this in the future.

Mr. CANNON. The sharp increase in cost of living immediately following curtailment of the activities of OPA demonstrates the truth of what the gentleman says.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to discuss amendment No. 20 and its implications. This amendment, in my opinion, definitely destroys rent control. It eliminates it. It calls for the liquidation of OPA in its entirety on or before June 30, 1947. There is no argument about that. The Division of Rent Control exists in OPA, which will be liquidated in its entirety under this amendment. It means the end of rent control. Now, you cannot come here and say that Congress may enact rent-control legislation later on and for that reason we must therefore provide for the liquidation of the Rent Control Division now. That is not the language of the friends of rent control; that is the language of the enemies of rent control. I think it is lamentable—and I do not mean this in personal criticism of my good friend from Missouri—I think it is lamentable that the Members of the minority party signed this report which knifes to pieces the program for rent control as we have had it heretofore.

Mr. CANNON. Our agreement to this conference report, of course, was on the premise that immediate legislation would be drafted and enacted to preserve the essential benefits both of the rationing of sugar and the maintenance of the rent-control program.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I should like to ask this question of the gentleman from Missouri and I would ask it also of

the Members of the other side of the House: I inserted in the RECORD of March 6 a telegram and a letter from the Governor of the State of Oklahoma pointing out that unless we have a deficiency appropriation for the school-lunch program affecting 180,000 school children in Oklahoma alone that it is going to die on March 31. I wish to ask this question of the Republican side of the House: Under the mandate that you talk about of last November 5, did you get a mandate to stop the school-lunch program in this Nation? Of course you did not.

Now, let us find out one other thing. I have never been too strong for deficiency appropriations in the main, but in a program like this where you are buying food and other commodities which have risen in cost since October of 1946, though no fault of the people who have to purchase this food, I am going to ask you this one question—I will address it to the gentleman from New York: Is the gentleman's party willing to accept the responsibility for killing a program such as this?

Mr. TABER. Seventy-five million dollars was all that the Democratic party dared pass last June and go to the country on.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will ask the gentleman whether he will support a deficiency appropriation now to carry on the school-lunch program for the rest of the fiscal year?

Mr. TABER. Have not the gentleman's people back home sufficient confidence in the school-lunch program to carry it on themselves and meet their own responsibility?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The State of Oklahoma, and the other States as well, are meeting their proportionate share. That I take is a complete answer. The gentleman's position is that he is not willing to carry it on. I want the people of this Nation and the people back in Oklahoma to know that this is the way the gentleman's party is carrying out the mandate that was given them last fall. I do not believe the gentleman's party got any mandate to kill such a program as this.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has frankly admitted his opposition to this program. Knowing the gentleman as I do I make this observation, that we Democrats can be proud of the fact that we put it into the law. The Republicans are going to destroy it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse the remarks of my friend and colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], with reference to the school-lunch program. I know that I came here under a mandate from the people of my part of Oklahoma to continue this very important project.

Furthermore, while on this subject of deficiency appropriations, I want to urge that the next deficiency bill provide sufficient funds to carry on our Indian schools, hospitals, and other services at their present levels.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I have always sup-

ported the school-lunch program. I feel from personal observation it has been very helpful to many of the school children of Texas. I would regret very much to see this program handicapped. For 3 years I taught in rural schools and at times I have observed children who did not have proper food at noontime. I think this is unfortunate with reference to any child anytime and should not be tolerated. The school-lunch program takes care of such a situation. The program should not be discontinued or handicapped in any way.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the protection of the public against inflation in the price of the necessities of life, in time of war, is fundamental. And that is particularly true of rents—and to only slightly lesser degree in the distribution of such staples as sugar. We are advised by those in a position to know that but for the control and rationing of sugar during the war years the price would have risen to something like 70 cents per pound, and the channels of supplies so monopolized by confectioners, distillers, soft-drink processors, and other large industrial users that the average housewife would have been entirely deprived of sugar most of the time. Due to devastation of sugar-producing areas in the Philippines, the East Indies, and other sugar-manufacturing centers the recovery of the industry has been delayed so that the world supply is still tragically short. In order to insure each family having its proportional supply it has been necessary to continue rationing, and will be necessary to continue rationing in the future, until normal supplies are available.

Likewise, war conditions require the control of rents in order to avoid intolerable conditions which would otherwise skyrocket housing costs to a figure which would so seriously hamper the mobilization of labor in industrial centers as to threaten the success of the war program. Due to lack of construction of the normal increase in housing during the war, rent control also is necessary in the reconversion period pending resumption of construction and the provision of necessary housing throughout the Nation.

The bill now before the House liquidates all OPA control of both rents and foods, including sugar, by June 30, 1947. This means discontinuation of enforcement as of April 30. It is true that proponents of this summary conclusion of OPA activities insist that sufficient funds have been provided to continue enforcement to June 30. But the facts are otherwise. Here is a comment in this morning's Washington Daily News:

Your Government reporter learns—That OPA, after several weeks of indecision while Congress debated its appropriation bill, now is making definite plans to fold up by April 30.

This is an authoritative report on actual conditions. It leaves us in the analogous position of having a rent-control law on the statute books until June 30 but no administrative agency and no means of enforcement after April 30. Unless prompt steps are taken to provide for the hiatus, we will be without rationing and control through May and June.

It was only on the assurance that legislation is already being drafted to continue the rationing of sugar through the Department of Agriculture and the control of rents through the Department of Commerce, or other competent agency, that we have signed the conference report and are supporting this bill.

It is to be hoped that there will be no unnecessary delay in the enactment of this emergency legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York give me 5 minutes to complete my presentation?

Mr. TABER. I have not very much time left and I have other commitments. I am sorry. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the field day which has been indulged in over the question of the school-lunch program is indicative of what we may expect during the rest of the legislative year. I was here when the school-lunch program was inaugurated. The plea of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentleman from Missouri—the latter being the great economy-minded gentleman of the Congress—then was, that we were confronted with agricultural surpluses and one of the splendid ways to get rid of those agricultural surpluses was to have the school children of America eat them up. That was the justification for the program when it started. Now, with that beginning it has grown into a permanent program of some stature. There were \$75,000,000 appropriated last year to carry on this program that the gentleman from Oklahoma went into such ecstasies about. As a matter of fact, I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that in my State we had a school-lunch program long before the New Deal was ever thought of. I do not suppose you ever had that sort of an idea down in Oklahoma and some of these other States. However, the States of this Union and the municipalities that comprise those States are fully able to maintain and to finance a school-lunch program. They have the equipment now that can be used, and it will be used.

What you are in effect saying is that the States of this Union, which as a whole make up these United States, will not carry on this great magnanimous, magnificent program which you gentlemen say is going to keep the children of this Nation alive. They are going to let it die. The only way you can keep it alive, according to them, is for the Federal Government to step in and finance it and send the charge back to the same States with a clip-off at the Federal end of it for handling the transaction.

My friend from Missouri should not play both sides of the street. We either ought to stand for a program of economy or we ought to stand for the program that has so long represented the New Deal—a spending program. Either we are going to get on to this economy program or we are not. It will not do for the gentleman from Missouri or some one else to stand up here and talk economy one day out of one side of his mouth

and the next day stand up here and preach for this program or that program which means another very large sum of money which the States and the municipalities are perfectly able to take care of themselves. May I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the question facing the people of this country is simply this: Are we going to put back into the hands of the States and the people of the States the responsibility that is theirs?

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder how I ever grew up. I wonder how I ever got this stature. I lived in a period when we did not have the school-lunch program. I wonder how I ever got through it. I wonder how you people who are out there ever got to grow up at all without somebody spoon-feeding you out of the Federal Treasury. It seems to me it is time we begin to get back to certain fundamentals and have the Government do the things that the Government ought to do here in Washington and let the local people do the things they ought to do and that they are equipped and are able to do and in most good communities want to do, may I say.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I make the observation that the gentleman did a pretty good job in growing up. He must have got plenty of lunches.

Mr. KEEFE. I got plenty of lunches and, may I add, we went out and did some work for some of those lunches. We knew how to work. The trouble is today nobody wants to work; everybody wants to have everything handed to him. It is a great thing to stand up here and raise your voice and picture the poor little children who are starving. The gentleman from Illinois stands up here and tells us that the prices are going up due to OPA being taken off, when he knows as well as I know, and so does the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Massachusetts know as well as I know, that you have the Commodity Credit Corporation representing the United States Government in every market in this Nation bidding the price of wheat up, competing against the miller, bidding the price of wheat up to \$2.75 a bushel in order that we might carry out our commitments to feed the entire world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. And, as long as that situation continues, and as long as a nation that for 25 years has never been able to completely feed itself and has been on a food-importing basis, as long as that nation attempts to feed the people of the world, you may expect that with Uncle Sam in the market places competing with the millers and private producers, that prices are going to rise. They are going to get higher; make no mistake about it.

This is a pretty critical situation that is facing this country, and you will be sobered up tomorrow when our Presi-

dent makes his speech from this rostrum. You will not be treating this so facetiously and laughing about it, as some of you are doing now. It is pretty serious business, and no one knows it better than the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Missouri, who attended the President's conference up at the White House. This is not anything to laugh about, and I want to tell the gentleman from Illinois that it does him no credit to try to throw every one of these discussions into a pure political discussion.

The salvation of our country is not a political question, and you gentlemen are going to have a hard time to join hands with us to save this country, and you know it, and yet on every one of these bills that come out here you make a field day of political discussion, injecting a lot of silly politics in it in order to accuse the Republicans of doing something bad.

Now, I will tell you what you are going to have to do. You are going to have to assume your responsibility in this world picture or not assume it, and if you do, prices are going to continue to rise, and the gentleman from Illinois or anybody else like him ought to tell the people of America the truth. These rising prices are not to be related to OPA. They are rising because America is attempting to feed the world out of a stock that never was designed for such purposes, and your Commodity Credit Corporation is in the market places bidding against local millers and local producers for that diminishing supply of goods.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to call the attention of my distinguished—

Mr. KEEFE. "The admiral from Wisconsin," as the gentleman called him one day.

Mr. CANNON. My distinguished and able and trusted friend from Wisconsin. He speaks of the President as "my" President. I trust he means "our" President.

Mr. KEEFE. I mean he is my President, and I so stated. He is going to come here tomorrow and tell you the truth, and you had better get ready for it, instead of standing up here and carrying on these piddling politics while the country is collapsing around our ears and while the whole world threatens to collapse. I am sick of it as far as I am concerned. We had better get along with our business instead of having these little piddling arguments while the whole world burns and is looking for action.

Mr. CANNON. There are 10 minutes remaining of the hour. I ask the gentleman from New York to yield me 5 minutes of the 10.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw the attention of my colleagues to

the critical necessity for continuing adequate rent-control administration and Federal rent control until June 30, 1948. This job must be carried on effectively, now, until there is new legislation turning it over to an agency other than OPA. A break-down at this time will incur consequences of the utmost gravity to my constituents and to millions of other Americans. After World War I rents shot up 50 to 75 percent and evictions multiplied, because there were no controls. With the cost of living now over 60 percent higher than in 1939, the people of moderate income cannot stand the strain. It would be felt in a galloping inflation and in labor strife.

Mr. Speaker, as far as housing is concerned, the war is still on. We may be reducing here several million dollars for OPA over what the Senate provided, but I do not believe that my constituents can afford that kind of economy. This is a regrettable conclusion for me as there are other provisions of this report which I favor very much.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 342, nays 49, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—342

Abernethy	Brooks	Crawford
Albert	Brophy	Crow
Allen, Calif.	Brown, Ga.	Cunningham
Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ohio	Curtis
Allen, La.	Bryson	Dague
Almond	Buck	D'Alesandro
Andersen	Buffett	Davis, Ga.
H. Carl	Burke	Davis, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Burleson	Dawson, Utah
Andersen	Busbey	Deane
August H.	Butler	Devitt
Andrews, Ala.	Byrnes, Wis.	D'Ewart
Andrews, N. Y.	Camp	Dirksen
Angell	Canfield	Dolliver
Arends	Cannon	Domengeaux
Arnold	Carson	Dondero
Auchincloss	Case, N. J.	Dorn
Bakewell	Case, S. Dak.	Doughton
Banta	Chadwick	Drewry
Barrett	Chelf	Durham
Bates, Ky.	Chenoweth	Eaton
Battle	Chilperfield	Elliott
Beall	Church	Ellis
Beckworth	Clason	Ellsworth
Bender	Clements	Elsaesser
Bennett, Mich.	Clevenger	Elston
Bennett, Mo.	Clippinger	Engel, Mich.
Bishop	Coffin	Engle, Calif.
Blackney	Cole, Kans.	Evins
Bland	Cole, Mo.	Fallon
Boggs, Del.	Colmer	Fenton
Boggs, La.	Combs	Fernandez
Bolton	Cooley	Fisher
Bonner	Cooper	Flannagan
Boykin	Corbett	Fletcher
Bradley, Calif.	Cotton	Folger
Bradley, Mich.	Coudert	Foot
Bramblett	Courtney	Forand
Brehm	Cox	Fulton

Gamble	Lea	Richards
Gary	LeCompte	Riehlman
Gathings	Lemke	Riley
Gavin	Lewis	Rivers
Gearhart	Lodge	Rizley
Gifford	Love	Robertson
Gillette	Lucas	Robison
Gillie	Lusk	Rockwell
Goff	Lyle	Rogers, Fla.
Goodwin	McConnell	Rogers, Mass.
Gore	McCowan	Rohrbough
Gossett	McDonough	Ross
Graham	McDowell	Russell
Grant, Ala.	McGarvey	Sadlak
Grant, Ind.	McGregor	St. George
Gregory	McMahon	Sanborn
Griffiths	McMillan, S. C.	Sarbacher
Gross	McMillen, Ill.	Sasser
Gwynn, N. Y.	MacKinnon	Schwabe, Mo.
Gwynne, Iowa	Macy	Schwabe, Okla.
Hagen	Mahon	Scoblick
Hale	Maloney	Scott, Hardie
Hall	Manasco	Scott,
Edwin Arthur	Mansfield, Tex.	Hugh D., Jr.
Hall	Martin, Iowa	Scrivner
Leonard W.	Mason	Seely-Brown
Halleck	Mathews	Shafer
Hand	Meade, Md.	Sheppard
Hardy	Meyor	Sikes
Harris	Mitchener	Simpson, Ill.
Harrison	Miller, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Hays	Miller, Conn.	Smith, Kans.
Hébert	Miller, Md.	Smith, Maine
Hedrick	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Ohio
Hendricks	Mills	Smith, Wis.
Herter	Mitchell	Snyder
Heseltun	Monroney	Springer
Hill	Morris	Stanley
Hinshaw	Morrison	Stefan
Hobbs	Morton	Stevenson
Hoeven	Muhlenberg	Stigler
Hoffman	Mundt	Stockman
Holmes	Murray, Tenn.	Stratton
Hoopes	Murray, Wis.	Sundstrom
Horan	Nixon	Taber
Howell	Nodar	Talle
Hull	Norblad	Taylor
Jackson, Calif.	Norman	Teague
Jarman	O'Hara	Thomas, N. J.
Jenison	O'Konski	Thomas, Tex.
Jenkins, Ohio	Owens	Thomason
Jennings	Passman	Tibbott
Jensen	Patman	Tollefson
Johnson, Calif.	Patterson	Towe
Johnson, Ill.	Peden	Trimble
Johnson, Ind.	Peterson	Twyman
Johnson, Okla.	Phillips, Calif.	Vall
Johnson, Tex.	Phillips, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Jones, Ala.	Pickett	Vinson
Jones, N. C.	Ploesser	Vorrs
Jones, Ohio	Plumley	Vursell
Jones, Wash.	Poage	Wadsworth
Jonkman	Potts	Weichel
Judd	Poulson	West
Kearney	Preston	Wheeler
Kearns	Price, Fla.	Whitten
Keating	Priest	Whittington
Kee	Rains	Williams
Keefe	Ramey	Wilson, Ind.
Kerr	Rankin	Wilson, Tex.
Kersten, Wis.	Rayburn	Winstead
Kilburn	Redden	Wolcott
Kilday	Reed, N. Y.	Wolverton
Kunkel	Reeves	Worley
Landis	Rich	Youngblood
Latham		Zimmerman

NAYS—49

Blatnik	Havener	Marcantonio
Bloom	Holifield	Morgan
Buchanan	Huber	Murdock
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	O'Brien
Celler	Javits	O'Toole
Crosser	Karsten, Mo.	Philbin
Delaney	Kefauver	Powell
Dingell	Kennedy	Price, Ill.
Donohue	Kirwan	Rabin
Douglas	Klein	Rayfield
Eberhart	Lane	Rooney
Fogarty	Lanham	Sabath
Gordon	Lynch	Sadowski
Gorski	McCormack	Smathers
Granger	Madden	Spence
Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield,	Walter
Hart	Mont.	

NOT VOTING—41

Barden	Cole, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.
Bates, Mass.	Cravens	Hartley
Bell	Dawson, Ill.	Heffernan
Buckley	Felgahn	Hess
Bulwinkle	Fellows	Jenkins, Pa.
Byrne, N. Y.	Fuller	Kelley
Chapman	Gallagher	Keogh
Clark	Gerlach	King

Knutson	Norton	Somers
Larcade	Pfeifer	Welch
LeFevre	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Lesinski	Rees	Wood
Meade, Ky.	Short	Woodruff
Norrell	Smith, Va.	

So the conference report was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Fuller for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Kelley against.

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Wigglesworth for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. King against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bates of Massachusetts with Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Knutson with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. Harness of Indiana with Mr. Larcade.

Mr. Fellows with Mr. Lesinski.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Somers.

Mr. Short with Mr. Barden.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce the absence of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] due to a death in his family, and state that he will be absent during the remainder of the week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Colonel Smith and a speech delivered by himself.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some correspondence.

EDUCATIONAL AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2473) to authorize the transfer without charge to the States and their political subdivisions of all interest of the United States in educational and recreational facilities acquired under the Act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection?

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2436) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2436, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the first paragraph of the bill had been read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: For personal services in the District of Columbia, including the operating force of the Treasury Building, the Treasury Annex, the Liberty Loan Building, the Auditors' Building, and the west and south annexes thereof, \$650,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday while the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] was speaking, I interrupted him to ask about the funds for the extension of rural mail routes. I told him it was my understanding that a large number of these extensions had been provided and that no funds were available to put those extensions into operation.

After the Congress adjourned I got in touch with the Post Office Department and was informed that those shortages could not be covered by this bill, because this is the appropriation measure for the fiscal year 1948, and funds must be provided in a deficiency bill if these short extensions in the various sections of the country are to be made.

I make this statement because of the fact that the debate on yesterday would leave the impression that these deficiencies could be taken care of by amendment to the present bill. But that is not the case. These funds must be provided, if they are to be provided at all, in a deficiency bill.

I call this proposition to the attention of the Members to clear the record on that point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Does the gentleman mean the funds for the period from now until June 30 of this year?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. EBERHARTER. How about the regular funds for the fiscal year 1948? Are they provided for in this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. They told me they thought the funds provided in the present bill would be sufficient for the next fiscal year. If not, a deficiency bill could be brought in in the next session.

But all over this country, in every agricultural section, extensions of rural mail routes have been provided. They have been surveyed and approved, but the Department does not have the money to put them into operation.

So I just want to serve notice now that when the next deficiency bill comes before the House the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has promised me an opportunity to appear before the committee in favor of an item to take care of those extensions. My position has been, as you all know, that if we provide mail for one man, we

should provide it for all. It is my contention that we should extend a mail route and a rural power line to every farmhouse in America. I will make only this limitation: I will say to every house that can be found by the tax gatherer in times of peace or that can be reached by the draft in time of war.

There is no reason for us to pinch pennies on rural mail routes and on rural electrification and then spend the billions of dollars that America is called upon to contribute to other sections of the world.

Nothing that I can think of will do more to strengthen this country than to provide mail service and electric power service to every farm home in this country.

I shall continue my efforts toward the attainment of that end.

The Clerk read as follows:

Refunding internal-revenue collections: For refunding internal-revenue collections, as provided by law, including the payment of claims for the prior fiscal years and payment of accounts arising under "Allowance or drawback (Internal Revenue)," "Redemption of stamps (Internal Revenue)," "Refunding legacy taxes, act of March 30, 1928," "Repayment of taxes on distilled spirits destroyed by casualty," and "Refunds and payments of processing and related taxes," \$1,231,000,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress by internal-revenue districts and alphabetically arranged of all disbursements hereunder in excess of \$500 as required by section 3 of the act of May 29, 1928 (sec. 3776, I. R. C.), including the names of all persons and corporations to whom such payments are made, together with the amount paid to each.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 12, in line 20, strike out "\$1,231,000,000" and insert "There is hereby appropriated such amount as may be necessary for prompt payment of tax refunds."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, withholding taxes are now being withheld from the pay rolls of 55,000,000 American citizens. Those taxes are being withheld not at the rates which some future tax bill may fix. Those taxes are being withheld at the rate of the present tax law.

The principal reason which the committee assigns for its guess that there will be less claim for tax refunds can be found on page 16 of the committee report. Please understand I am not endeavoring to criticize the members of the committee. They have undoubtedly done a conscientious job, and they worked hard. Nevertheless, it behooves the Members of the House to examine any innovation, to examine any guess, to determine for themselves the rightness of the course. I would like to read to you at least one of the reasons they give. They say: "Coupled with the expectation of several million less taxpayers filing as a result of prospective changes in the tax laws, it is felt that the reduced figure would more nearly approximate the amount required."

Let us see how that operates. There are 55,000,000 taxpayers from whom withholding taxes are now being withheld. If we cut 20 percent of them off what is the result? We do not decrease the number of claimants for tax refunds, we increase it. As a matter of fact, 30,500,000 taxpayers in the last fiscal year filed claims for refund; so we cannot escape the conclusion that the reasoning and the logic behind this statement is inaccurate. The very opposite will be the effect.

Through my amendment I am offering to put into the bill the language which has been in the bill since the enactment of the withholding tax law. Originally the Appropriations Committee and the House wrote into appropriation bills specific amounts for tax refunds, but with the enactment of the withholding tax the claims became so large that it became an impractical procedure.

If we place this specific appropriation in the bill it not only serves as an appropriation but it operates as a limitation: The Treasury of the United States cannot make tax refunds in an amount larger than this figure which is \$300,000,000 below that which the Bureau of Internal Revenue estimates the tax refunds will be for the next fiscal year. Unless, therefore, the Congress passes another appropriation bill, a deficiency appropriation bill, sometime before the end of the fiscal year, we will tie the hands of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and prevent them from making prompt tax refunds to people who are entitled to them. With what result? The millions of small income taxpayers who have overpaid will not get prompt refunds of the money which they need, and the second result will be that we will just prolong the period during which 6-percent interest will have to be paid on these refunds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, instead of being content to examine the language of the report my good friend from Tennessee should have busied himself a little with the actual testimony that was taken on this item. I believe that would make it quite clear.

There was estimated for tax refunds in the President's budget \$2,031,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948. The committee, after taking testimony from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, from the Chairman of the Excess Profits Tax Council, from Dr. Atkeson, who is one of the fiscal experts in the Treasury Department, and from the Alcohol Tax Unit, finally concluded that this amount could be very safely diminished on the basis of their own testimony. When I queried Dr. Atkeson I asked, "How did you arrive at this amount of \$2,031,000,000?" Then he began to give me figures and set forth the arithmetic for the estimate. I said, "Doctor, I do not want to know about arithmetic, I want to know what the theory is behind it." And when we got all through—you will

find his answer on page 496 of the hearings—he said, “It is the best guess that we can make.”

Now that is the Treasury Department speaking. When Mr. Hamel, chairman of the Excess Profits Tax Council, who has been a practicing tax attorney for 25 years and once served as a member of the Board of Tax Appeals, came before the committee it was the same thing. He said, “It is the best guess we can make.” But there was another answer to it that was highly intriguing. We finally discovered, and you will find it in the hearings, when all is said and done the Treasury did not even make the guess. The guess was made by the Bureau of the Budget which is not only a fiscal arm, but in a sense one of the political arms of the Presidency. I said, “Perhaps our guess is as good as yours.” He said, “Perhaps so.”

Now then, it was not a guess after all. First, you will find that in this total item as disclosed on page 568 of the hearings you take off \$123,000,000. Treasury officers testified that if the excise-tax bill went through there were \$123,000,000 in this estimate that ought to be deducted. That is not the gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN talking to you, that is the Treasury Department testifying before the committee. With respect to excess-profits refunds, I said to Mr. Hamel: “I suppose you get frivolous cases where people simply file and later on you discover there is no foundation to the case.” He said, “Many of them.” He said, “I did some missionary work in the country.” You will find it recorded on pages 548 and 549 of the hearings. He said, “A great many cases have been withdrawn and one-half of all the cases have been disposed of.” Since June of last year they allowed \$42,000,000 in refunds on excess profits and they have asked for \$420,000,000 in this bill for fiscal 1948.

There is a little something wrong with this kind of arithmetic. It becomes the responsibility of the subcommittee, having some knowledge of arithmetic, to come to certain conclusions. Budget officials have reached up and made a fine guess. Our friend from Tennessee proposes to make this an indefinite appropriation like it was and to leave it an open-ended amount. If you will examine the language of the bill you will discover that we made it a definite appropriation. We want them to come back and tell us at the end of this year or the beginning of the next fiscal year what they have done with the money.

I believe that the Congress, which has the power of the purse under the Constitution, is entitled to know what happens to money that goes out of the Treasury of the United States. Yet only one copy on refunds is filed with the Ways and Means Committee and I am frank to say to you we have not had a look at a single refund case to find out whether it was justified or not. So we made it a definite appropriation. We take their own figures, we take their own statement that there is going to be a diminution in the case load here, and I think we have treated them with great generosity in taking out only \$800,000,000.

It has been said that this is a phoney item. That word “phoney” was bandied about on this floor in committee yesterday. There was also talk about legislative duplicity. Let me say to you that the President of the United States carries all this in the expenditure budget for the fiscal year 1948. When we deal with a ceiling we are dealing with a ceiling on expenditures. So we are only taking the bookkeeping of the Government of the United States and adapting our processes and techniques accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am wondering in connection with this estimate that the committee made. Suppose the money runs out, say in 8 months of the fiscal year 1948. May I ask whether the subcommittee would consider a deficiency appropriation bill so that these taxpayers who are entitled to refund of this money can get it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has no choice in the matter because deficiency estimates are prepared by the budget Bureau. They are approved by the President. They can send us a roomful of deficiencies and we cannot stop them. The only question is whether or not we propose to enact the deficiency after we have taken further testimony. It would be a grand idea, after some experiences under this item as set up by the subcommittee, if they would come back and tell us the whole story. Now, we are proposing that that be done because we said in the report that through the power of legislative oversight of the subcommittee we propose to follow through on this matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I got the impression from the gentleman's remarks yesterday afternoon that it was the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to have less deficiency appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It certainly is.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, now, further, the gentleman is giving the impression that he has no confidence in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which passes upon these refunds if they amount to over a certain small figure. Now the gentleman is giving the House the impression that nobody checks on these refunds. I will say that there is a set-up by law whereby the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation passes on these refunds and the legality of them, so that I hope the gentleman will not leave the wrong impression here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, the gentleman from Illinois has not even mentioned the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue

Taxation, insofar as he knows. The gentleman from Illinois is dealing with money that goes out of the Treasury of the United States, not money that comes in. That is the function of the Committee on Appropriations, and that is the reason this item appears in an appropriation bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to say that there is a special council that passes upon these refunds, and it is up to the Treasury Department, with the approval of the special committee set up by law, to pass upon it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This subcommittee undertakes to clearly stay within its prerogatives and within its powers, so that when an item of \$2,031,000,000 is submitted to us we take testimony from everybody in the Treasury Department who can throw some light on this subject.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In asking the gentleman to yield, I first want to say that I entertain for him not only the highest regard but the most genuine fondness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate that.

Mr. GORE. And any difference in point of view between him and me, both members of the Committee on Appropriations, is purely on a matter of principle, and no antagonistic personalities whatsoever are involved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that, and I reciprocate with equal fervor the grace that is so beautifully expressed by my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I would not ask the distinguished and able gentleman to yield except that I only had 5 minutes and I was unable in that time to develop adequately my point of view, and if the gentleman will let me ask him a couple of matter-of-fact questions, I will be glad to ask unanimous consent that his time be again extended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. GORE. Since the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee stated on the floor yesterday that this provision did not save one dime to the taxpayers of the country or to the Treasury, I wonder what virtue this provision has. Now, the gentleman undertakes to assign to it the virtue that he is going to have the Bureau of Internal Revenue come back to Congress and tell what they did with the money. The appropriation bill for last year contained the identical provision which you will find on page 11, which requires that an accurate report be made, and as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue searches and passes upon these refunds. Now the gentleman would not state, I am sure, that it is his intention to forestall and prevent prompt refunds of taxes, and then if that is his purpose, if that is the purpose of the committee and of his party, why do we place this limitation in the bill? The Treasury is certainly not going to make refunds to which taxpayers are not legally entitled. If you are going to bring in a deficiency bill, that will serve

the purpose, but it makes useless work for the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the distinguished gentleman be extended three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, let us answer the first question: What is this item doing here anyway? Here is a tremendous document that was prepared especially by the Bureau of the Budget at the instance of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations when we were working on the legislative budget.

Here is an analysis of the expenditure, not by the Appropriations Committee but by the Budget Bureau. When you get down to the Treasury Department, here is an item of \$2,031,000,000 inserted by the Budget Bureau in the 1948 appropriation, and it is inserted in the 1948 budget of expenditure. So as we deal with appropriations and expenditures we of necessity have to deal with this item.

In response to the second question raised by the gentleman from Tennessee, this has been carried as an indefinite, open-end appropriation heretofore. I have set myself against indefinite appropriations ever since I learned to know the difference between what constitutes annual, ascertained, and definite appropriations and those that are permanent and indefinite. Our Budget is filled with billions of dollars of permanent and indefinite appropriations that we can examine in only a casual and cursory way from year to year. That is the reason not a single specific refund case was presented to the subcommittee.

What we say now is, this is going to be definite and this is going to be annual, and it is going to be for an ascertained amount. When in June of 1947 the Treasury officials came before the subcommittee we can then ask, "What did you do with the money? Let us see the whole record, now, so we can carefully examine and see whether the moneys of the taxpayers of the United States have been carefully and properly husbanded." So it is on the basis of making it definite that we conclude on the basis of their own testimony that this can be safely reduced by that amount, and that is implemented by the fact that additional testimony was offered, perhaps off the record, in the Committee on Ways and Means, and I am hopeful that the gentleman from New York will address himself to that matter very briefly.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wonder how the distinguished gentleman arrived at the conclusion that because "several million" taxpayers are expected to be cut off the tax roll there would be fewer and not more claims for tax refunds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is that it appears in the expenditure budget over the hand of the President and the Budget itself. Why should more

money be reflected in the expenditure budget than the money they actually need? Of course, they have not yet got over the technique of blank checks, of long ago. You just write out \$500,000,000 for the President of the United States and then hope that at the end of the fiscal year he will probably give you a report. No; there is a change now. We are getting on a very definite basis. It is so easy to show a smaller budget and then revise it later in the year to show progress toward economy. We propose to make it reflect the true condition if we can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. The estimates in the budget of the President were based upon present tax laws. It was very necessary that an estimate for tax refunds be contained in the budget, because tax refunds can be made only through disbursement from the Treasury. Disbursement from the Treasury can be made only upon authorization from the Congress. Therefore it was entirely proper, there was no legerdemain about it, that this item be included in the budget. It is entirely proper that in the budget of the Congress this item be included. But the gentleman and the distinguished committee of which he is a member have arbitrarily made a guess that the amount of refunds will be \$800,000,000 less than was estimated by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Budget and the President, and he assigns as one of his reasons that the taxes are going to be cut and several millions will be cut off the tax rolls. The President estimated and the Bureau of the Budget estimated that there would be claims for refund of \$2,031,000,000 for the next fiscal year under present taxes. If the gentleman is going to reduce taxes 20 percent or by whatever amount, he is going to increase rather than decrease the amount of tax refunds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes to make proper answer to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Illinois thus far has said exactly nothing about the changes in taxes or changes in the internal-revenue laws that might diminish the number of tax payments. The gentleman from Illinois puts it strictly on the ground that the Treasury arithmetic is faulty and that it is a guess. Let us take a look. There is \$420,000,000 in this estimated item for excess-profits-tax refunds. You will find in the statement made by the chairman of the Excess

Profits Tax Council that it is stated that \$8,000,000,000 in claims will be filed, but \$8,000,000,000 had not actually been filed.

As a matter of fact, I asked the Treasury to send me the most recent and current statement. It came a day or two ago. Only \$4,562,000,000, about one-half of the estimate, has been filed. It only increased about \$450,000,000 since June of 1946. By their own testimony and by their own statement, they have disposed of nearly 19,000 of those cases, and that is about one-half the number of the cases involving \$680,000,000. How much money was allowed? Here is their figure—\$42,500,000. Yet, they come along and insert an estimate of \$420,419,148 for fiscal 1948. If you take the most advantageous percentage figure, it probably would not run over \$160,000,000. Can you wonder why the Treasury did not belabor the point?

Number two is the \$123,000,000 which they said should be deducted just as soon as action was completed on the excise tax bill. Finally comes this estimate of more accurate returns as familiarity with existing tax law develops everywhere in the country. That is what the Treasury said to us. So, I believe we can safely diminish this amount by \$100,000,000.

I am confident there will be sufficient money to take care of every taxpayer for whom my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, is so concerned. That is the whole story.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With respect to the liability of the Federal Government to taxpayers, we have to meet that liability when payday comes anyway?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. Nobody quarrels about that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, nobody claims that the subcommittee or the full Committee on Appropriations would ever deny a taxpayer a refund if he is entitled to it. Secondly, why does not the gentleman tell us of the advantages to a person who desires to stuff his budget looking forward to a future date?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Illinois wanted to be reasonably circumspect about it, although I mentioned it yesterday afternoon.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman can be reasonable and can still tell us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Suppose all this money was not going to be used, and we have reason to believe from very creditable sources that it will not be used in fiscal 1948. If it were stuffed so that next year there can be a diminution in amount, somebody may decide that the Congress can take credit for a budget of expenditure which is a good deal smaller than if bookkeeping had been carried on in a very candid way. That is the whole story and I suppose it ought to be told. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate it is quite difficult for the members of the committee today to get into their heads clearly these huge figures. The last remarks of the gentleman from Illinois give the im-

pression that somebody is trying to stuff the figures in the budget, insofar as these tax refunds are concerned.

Let me call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that for the fiscal year 1946 the Treasury estimated to the Congress in the President's budget message that the refunds for the fiscal year 1946 would be \$3,116,800,710. The actual refunds, Mr. Chairman, amounted to \$3,110,000,000, so that on that three thousand-million-dollars estimate the Budget Bureau was only off \$6,000,000, that is a \$6,000,000 overestimate. That shows that there was no stuffing at that time.

For the fiscal year 1947 the Treasury estimated that the tax refunds would amount to \$2,138,807,000.

I call your attention to the fact that up to the end of the first 3 months of 1947 the tax refunds already amount to \$1,200,000,000. So under the budget estimates, for the balance of this fiscal year, there is only allowed \$800,000,000. This proves conclusively that they did not stuff their estimates for the fiscal year 1947.

The estimate for 1948, of course, is only \$2,031,000,000. That shows it is coming down. There is no stuffing there at all. What is the use of putting figures in an appropriation bill that do not mean anything? The law says particularly that this money must be paid. The law says it must be paid. So, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] brought out, what is the use of putting a limitation on the amount of money that the Treasury can pay out when we have passed substantive law saying that as soon as this money is due to the taxpayers the Treasury Department must pay it right away? What is the use of saying in this appropriation bill, You cannot pay to the taxpayer what is legally due him if the total amounts to more than \$1,231,000,000. It all goes to prove the point that you are trying to show the public you are now saving \$800,000,000. It will just call for another deficiency item later in this session.

I think I could show you without question that for many years past the estimates that have been furnished under recent tax bills, and proposed tax bills, by the Treasury Department and the Budget Bureau, were unbelievably right. There is no stuffing in the President's budget and I hope the country does not feel that way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield, gladly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the RECORD should clearly show that this is really no saving. It is attempted to create the impression that this is a saving of \$800,000,000 but it is not in fact any real economy; because if the refunds are greater than are carried in this bill, we will have to appropriate money later on, because it is the law and amounts to a contract. If this amount of money is appropriated and the refunds are less, the excess money would stay in the Treasury anyway, being appropriated for a specific purpose. So the \$800,000,000 is in no sense an actual real saving of a single dollar.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is absolutely correct.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield with pleasure to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CANFIELD. The chairman of the subcommittee is not trying to fool the House or the country on this item.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will say for the gentleman that the gentleman from New Jersey said plainly and frankly that the subcommittee was not trying to give the impression that the Congress was going to save \$800,000,000 by putting this estimate in it.

Mr. CANFIELD. One other word. The gentleman has been talking about Treasury estimates. I am reading from the hearings, page 569. Dr. Atkeson, who spoke for the Treasury, said:

We are not, under the law nor in practice, responsible for preparing the estimates that enter into the President's budget.

They were not made by the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I add further, the House should know this, that the action we took in this respect was unanimous on the part of the subcommittee, between the minority as well as the majority. Furthermore, when we presented our story to the full committee the other day there was no dissent in the full committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, you know there are times when the minority members of a subcommittee can be wrong also.

The only effect of this short-changing the Treasury \$800,000,000 is that when the money appropriated in this bill is exhausted, then the taxpayers who are entitled to these refunds will be told, "We have no money in the Treasury with which to pay you, but never mind, Uncle Sam will pay you 6 percent interest until we get around to getting the Congress to give us additional money to pay you what is owed to you."

So you are not saving any money. In fact, you are charging the Federal Government 6 percent interest for failing to pay these claims immediately when the amount due is ascertained.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee with pleasure.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is entirely correct. If this limitation on tax refunds has any effect upon expenditures of the United States Government it will increase the expenditures; in no way can it reduce them. But what I rose to answer was this inference that the Budget Bureau and the President made a political estimate. I thoroughly agree with the statement of

the Bureau of Internal Revenue that they have no responsibility for the figures placed in the budget, that is the responsibility of the Bureau of the Budget and the President. They are responsible, however, for submitting estimates to the Bureau of the Budget and to the President. I have not talked to the Bureau of the Budget, but I have been down to inquire at the Bureau of Internal Revenue and they support entirely the accuracy of the estimates contained in the budget. They say that, in their opinion, if there is any error it is underestimated instead of overestimated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to see if I could make a slight contribution, at least toward keeping the record straight. I think there is a great deal of guesswork, and probably of necessity, in regard to this question of how much money should be placed in the appropriation bill relating to refunds. It is very easy to be misled, and I doubt if in years I have been quite so stunned as I was when we were having a meeting of a Joint Committee on Taxation to listen to the report of Judge Hamel. He has charge of refunds under the excess-profits tax provisions of section 722 of the revenue act. I made very careful notes, because, as I say, I was very much stunned when he made a statement of the total amount of refund claims filed to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Judge Hamel, the chairman of the council, stated that as of January 1, 1947, some 8,500 taxpayers had filed claims under section 722 for the refund—gross—of about \$6,000,000,000 of excess-profits taxes. Since claims for 1944 and 1945 had, in general, not yet been submitted, it was estimated that the total gross amount would be about \$8,000,000,000. About that point I wanted to take some smelling salts, but he proceeded.

Judge Hamel pointed out, however, that since a reduction of excess-profits tax involves an increase in ordinary income tax, the net amount involved would be somewhat over half this amount. Moreover, since 1942 taxpayers have been permitted to defer payment of 33 percent of the excess-profits taxes involved in claims under section 722, and in many cases the reduction in tax by reason of these claims will be less than the payment already deferred.

Judge Hamel stated that to March 1, 1947, the council had settled claims amounting to \$8,000,000 by allowing \$1,800,000 of which payment of about \$950,000 had been deferred. Moreover, claims aggregating about \$19,000,000 had been withdrawn and on these payments of \$3,200,000 had been deferred.

So the net result of that work was not a payment out of the Treasury but a net additional collection of taxes of about \$2,300,000.

When asked to make a rough guess as to the ultimate payment out of the Treasury that might be expected as the result

of settlement of all the section 722 claims, Judge Hamel stated that there might well be no net payment by the Treasury since on the basis of experience to date, amounts ultimately allowed might be greater than the taxes already deferred.

That is the way it usually runs. In the case of these tax refunds nobody can tell, and the possibility is that when we get to them they will be reduced almost to a minimum. I just wanted to make the record clear from the statement I took down from Judge Hamel.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I express disappointment in the fact that this Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill of approximately \$12,000,000,000 makes such a meager saving. After all of the charges of squandering and countercharges I heard here for the last several years, I had hoped that the Herculean efforts of the committee might indicate a larger amount in reduced spending. The net savings, I believe, is less than \$100,000,000 in the aggregate.

I presume that the committee found it necessary to sort of doctor up the report in order to make it look good, so necessarily this estimate of refunds was tampered with. Now I think that the committee really finds itself in hot water because it rooted around in terrain it was not familiar with.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said yesterday that he was going to give the committee some information which would indicate that this large item of estimated tax refunds really is a saving. Well, his explanation was not very convincing. No one in this House can tell me that a cut or a reduction—call it what you want—in the estimate covering tax refunds due the taxpayers constitutes a saving, because it does not. If the total amount of the estimate were eliminated entirely, it would not save one thin dime to the Treasury and to the American taxpayer. Therefore, this figure of \$800,000,000 is just spurious nonsense. It should not be considered here at all. If you take it out and the amount exceeds what the committee provides—that is, if the amount of refunds exceeds the amount that the committee provides herein—we will have to make a deficiency appropriation later. We in the Committee on Ways and Means handled this matter before, and it was through our study that the authority to refund was established. I know how interested the minority was at that time in the expeditious refunding of every excess dime that belonged to the taxpayer. There was no partisan facet to this move at the time. We were all interested in trying to speed legitimate refunds due under the law. I sat with the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] as a member of the joint committee at the time when we listened to witnesses testifying about these refunds

under section 722, and we did everything we could to speed up proper handling. I do not know whether this will slow it down or not, but I dare say that on the surface it appears it might, because if we limit the amount of the estimate, and the refunds exceed that amount, we are going to have to wait until the Committee on Appropriations gets together and provides authority to pay it out. In the meantime, the Treasury will have to pay 6 percent on the outstanding debt to the taxpayers. That is no way to save taxpayers' money, and I do not think that is what you want to do. In the meantime, the report indicates to Mr. John Q. Citizen that we are making a huge saving here, or at least he anticipates a saving of \$890,000,000, when, as a matter of fact, the sum total will be less than \$100,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. There is one other phase of this matter that should be emphasized a little more than has been up to this point. The whole purpose in carrying a provision of this type is in the interest of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Where more money has been collected from them by their Government than they owe under the law. That is the only purpose of having this provision here.

Now then, if you are going to impose the limitation contained in this bill, and if that amount is exceeded and the taxpayers are entitled to receive that money back, it means they may have to wait until Congress passes a deficiency appropriation bill to receive money they are already entitled to.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], who was standing before the time was fixed, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Michigan is a certified public accountant of very great ability, and I would like to ask him whether or not these amounts for tax refunds should not be chargeable against tax income instead of placed in the budget, which provides for expenditures for the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As to the exact manner the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget would handle these items in their bookkeeping, I would not want to say at this particular time, but I do not know of anyone in this Congress who would support a proposition which delays the paying of refunds to taxpayers who are entitled to those refunds. I do not know how any Congress or any committee would decline to make appropriations at the request of the responsible Government officials; and if the responsible Government officials have the abilities we are paying them for, they will have the estimates up here in time for the Congress to make the appropriations so that payment can be made on the due date,

and I assume that the Congress will be in session in the months to come and in the years to come, and, personally, I am very emphatically and categorically in favor of this reduction and against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. At the same time, I want to say that I do not know how anyone can support a group of taxpayers any better than through strict budgetary control, and I make that remark in response to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. Of course, these refunds are in the interest of the taxpayer who paid in excess of his liability, but it is in the interest of the taxpayer for this Congress and future Congresses to hold budgets within reasonable figures.

Here is a philosophy with which I entirely disagree, and I read from page 1224 of the RECORD of the current session:

I would far rather, as we start this new and useful budget mechanism, to set a spending ceiling figure high enough so that when the session is over we will not only have lived up to our pledge to stay within it, but we will have a margin of safety left. The Congress would then stand in a better light with the people we represent as being responsible. What extra margin we might be able to cut under our own spending ceiling—set in advance of the minute examination of appropriation requests—would be hailed as an extra windfall for economy.

If you can think of anything more destructive to the taxpayer, than that type of philosophy, tell me some day what it is. It is like a factory superintendent coming before the board of directors. He sets up a budget, we will say, for \$100,000, for repair and maintenance of a mill, when he knows good and well he can get through with \$60,000. But he stuffs his budget so that at the end of the period he can come in and throw up his hands and say, "Boss, isn't it swell? I saved you \$40,000; I give you back a windfall of \$40,000."

Now, this is skulduggery on the part of anyone who has anything to do with the budget; and our budgeteers have been so loose in past years with the funds of the taxpayers of this country that I think we have degenerated into moral sin as far as economic morality is concerned, and I am in favor of tightening down the lid, and when any budget comes in here, question the thing in every way we can, and then screw it down a little, and then let them come in and justify every penny they get.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was not the argument used in revising the January budget of 1946, in the month of August 1946, to show a fine saving, perhaps, when as a matter of fact it was just loose fiscal policy when the budget came before the Congress in the first instance?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is exactly what it was, and it is what has been carried on for 2 years. It is time for us to stop it. We have been entirely too loose. If we want to do the right thing for the people we will reduce the budget to the irreducible minimum based on the facts we could get at that time and the conditions which prevailed in this

country and throughout the world. Then as the necessity arises, if it does, let those facts be brought to the Congress and let the budget be increased at that time through deficiency appropriations or otherwise.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Is there not a very substantial reason why every item in the budget should be scrutinized by the committee in charge, that the spenders are the ones after all that appear with a vested interest to get more money? Is not that true?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly that is true. Our spending has been so great that we have created vested interests all over this country. It is time to cut off some of the gravy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 12, line 20, strike out the sum "\$1,231,000,000" and insert "there is hereby appropriated such amount as may be necessary for prompt payment of tax refunds."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORE) there were—ayes 57, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the Bureau, \$4,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as an indication of what fake economy can do, I call attention to a situation existing in the customs service at the port of Boston.

It has become necessary at the port of Boston to dispense with the services of approximately 200 temporary day laborers because of the lack of funds with which to hire these men.

These temporary day laborers, hired only when the volume of importations warrant, are used to truck bales of wool to and from scales, boring the bales to obtain samples, and similar manual labor, all under the supervision of customs inspectors. These laborers are also used in connection with the handling of general cargo but in the main are used in connection with wool importations.

During the current fiscal year, from July 1, 1946, to February 15, 1947, 247,018,908 pounds of foreign wool were entered for consumption at warehouse at the port of Boston. The Wool Trade Association anticipate a heavy import movement of wool during the remainder of the current fiscal year—and in fact for the next 2 years. Thus, using the quantity of wool received since July 1, 1946, we can expect approximately 148,

211,340 pounds of wool between now and June 30, 1947.

Seventy-five percent of the wool expected will be Australian and Cape wools, which, from experience over many years, gains from 4 to 12 pounds per bale over the invoice entered weights. Taking 6 pounds per bale as the average increase in weight the following computation is submitted to show the amount of revenue that would be collected if funds are made available for the weighing and boring of wool:

Quantity expected to be imported at Boston, Mass., 148,211,340 pounds.

Seventy-five percent of above wool will gain weight on voyage of importation, 111,158,507 pounds or approximately 370,528 bales.

Three hundred seventy thousand five hundred and twenty-eight bales at 6 pounds per bale increase in weight equals 2,223,168 pounds net.

Using average yield of 60 percent, 1,333,901 pounds clean content.

Duty of 34 cents per pound, \$453,526.34 loss in revenue if wool is not weighed.

If imported wools are not weighed the laboratory percentage of clean content cannot be used, and it is necessary to have determination of percentage of clean content made by the visual method. Determination of percentage of clean content by visual method has resulted over the years in an average increase of 2 percent over the entered yield, whereas determination of percentage of clean content under laboratory method has resulted in an average increase of 4 percent over the entered yield. Thus, in addition to the loss in revenue of approximately \$453,526.34 outlined above, there would be a further loss in revenue of approximately \$15,117.42, due to the 2-percent loss in percentage of clean content between visual and laboratory method of determination, a total estimated loss in revenue of \$468,643.76 for the remainder of the current fiscal year at the port of Boston.

The majority of the 200 or more temporary laborers employed at the port of Boston are veterans, and they are deserving of every consideration, particularly when their continued employment will prevent a loss in revenue of approximately \$468,643.76 through an expenditure of \$100,000 for salaries.

The Customs Service is without funds for the employment of these temporary day laborers who are urgently needed to aid in weighing and boring wool importations. The granting of a deficiency appropriation will permit of the employment of these laborers and at the same time result in a net increase in revenue of \$368,643.76.

I call your attention to an article appearing in the American Import and Export Bulletin, volume XXVI, No. 2, February 17, 1947, which clearly evidences that more customs personnel is urgently needed throughout the United States. The article is based on the preliminary report on the field service of United States Customs made by the National Council of American Importers, Inc. Survey was made of the customs personnel situation at the headquarters

ports of the 20 leading customs districts in the United States. Assisting the National Council of American Importers in this survey were the Baltimore Association of Commerce, Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Detroit Board of Commerce, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, New York Board of Trade, Norfolk Association of Commerce, Portland (Maine) Chamber of Commerce, St. Albans (Vt.) Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Seattle Chamber of Commerce, and many others. This article is the preliminary report of the National Council of American Importers, Inc. The survey made by other than a governmental agency should prove of value. The economic report submitted to the Congress by President Truman on January 8, 1947, stresses the importance of international trade to the domestic aspects of employment, production, and purchasing power. The budget message submitted to the Congress on January 10, 1947, showed actual receipts from customs for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, as \$435,000,000, with estimates for the fiscal year 1946-47 as \$496,000,000, and for the year 1947-48 as \$517,000,000. These figures show a carefully estimated trend of steadily increasing imports of dutiable foreign products and the Customs Service should have an adequate force to expeditiously handle these imports.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Reference is made to your telephone request today for immediate and detailed information concerning the effect the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in cutting by \$3,500,000 the estimates for the appropriation, "Collecting the revenue from customs, 1948," will have on the Customs Service if it stands.

The current situation in the Customs Service is very difficult and highly unsatisfactory to the public. Shortage of personnel has resulted in delays in the clearance of merchandise and travelers and in the settlement of duty liabilities. Some relief from this situation was included in the \$36,000,000 estimate submitted for the 1948 customs appropriation.

If the cut of \$3,500,000 stands, we must operate in the fiscal year 1948 on approximately \$2,365,000 less than the rate of expenditure at which we were operating during the month of February 1947, the last period for which figures are available.

As 93½ percent of the customs appropriation is disbursed for salaries, and there is practically no possibility of curtailment in the remaining 6½ percent, covering rental of space, telephone service, cartage of examination packages, etc., this reduction will require the separation of such a substantial number of employees that some activities must be discontinued.

Careful examination of the possibilities for meeting this situation satisfies me that the only activity that can be discontinued without a substantial revision of statutory law is that directed toward the prevention of smuggling. While this is a clear statutory duty of the Customs Service, there is no statutory prescription as to how it shall be conducted and the effectiveness of our smuggling control has always depended upon the action of the Congress in furnishing funds.

Other functions of the Customs Service create bottlenecks through which all carriers, goods, and travelers entering the country must pass. The treatment to be given these carriers, goods, and travelers is prescribed by law and the Customs Service must operate to permit their passage through the customs control and to keep the records and accounts required by law in connection with their movement and the collection of the revenue incident thereto.

It is therefore clear that if the \$3,500,000 cut stands, the larger part of it must be met by the separation from our service of about 800 employees, practically all from the customs border patrol that operates against smuggling on the Mexican and Canadian boundaries and from the port patrols that operate against smuggling of narcotics, jewelry, watches, and other articles at the seaports and against the theft of merchandise from customs custody.

The total number of customs border patrolmen at the present time is 351 and the total number of port patrol officers on the pay roll is 1,605, including supervisory officers. It therefore appears that if we must meet this cut it can only be by separating about 200 customs border patrolmen and 600 port patrol officers. The border patrolmen are located in groups of twos and threes, mostly in isolated areas and small towns along the boundaries. The port patrol officers are principally at Seattle, Portland, Oreg., San Francisco, Los Angeles, Honolulu, New Orleans, Galveston, Mobile, Tampa, Miami, Norfolk, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston. At each of these ports the patrol force will have to be reduced about 40 percent for lack of funds.

In addition to the foregoing, the part of the \$3,500,000 cut which reflects a disallowance of additional employees to cope with the recognized increase in customs activities means that essential manpower must be supplied by abolishing positions for one activity in order to supply the additional employees absolutely required to collect the revenue from customs and maintain an orderly movement of carriers, goods, and passengers. This will mean a further depletion of the port patrol forces and the separation of those present incumbents of port-patrol officer positions who cannot meet the eligibility requirements for the positions which must be filled to avoid a break-down of the other activities of the customs service. This will require abolishing another 40 percent of the port-patrol-officer positions now filled, or a total of 80 percent.

The net result will be a discontinuance of customs patrol activities on the Canadian border except insofar as the overburdened Immigration Service can cover this work, and a reduction of smuggling prevention at the seaports to the activities of searching squads. The resulting increase in smuggling which will inevitably follow will not only cost more in revenue than any saving, but will be even more detrimental to the businessmen who will face the competition of smuggled and stolen goods.

Very truly yours,

W. R. JOHNSON,
Commissioner of Customs.

Mr. Chairman, in the bill as reported, the committee fixes the appropriation for rent for post-office quarters at \$13,000,000, a reduction of \$457,000 below the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and \$35,000 below the estimated expenditures for this item for 1947.

If the Post Office Department is to operate efficiently, it should have sufficient money in its rent appropriation to obtain suitable and adequate quarters. We all know that rents are increasing all over the country, and especially in metropolitan areas and I do not see how the

Post Office Department can continue to rent satisfactory quarters, in the face of this continuing rise in rentals, with the reduction that the committee has made in this item.

Undoubtedly there are places throughout the country where more space should be provided to properly carry on the post-office business and there is certainly no provision for this in this bill, which does not provide even as much as the estimated expenditures for 1947.

Considering the entire situation, it seems to me that the amount recommended by the committee for this item is entirely inadequate to meet reasonable needs.

The Clerk read as follows:

Reimbursement to District of Columbia, benefit payments to White House Police and Secret Service forces: For reimbursement to the District of Columbia on a monthly basis for benefit payments made from the revenues of the District of Columbia to members of the White House Police force and such members of the United States Secret Service Division as are entitled thereto under the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1118), to the extent that such benefit payments are in excess of the salary deductions of such members credited to said revenues of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1948, pursuant to section 12 of the act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as amended, \$68,500.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the members of the Appropriations Committee who brought in this bill are to be commended today. We are making a start back over the road toward economy in Government. In debating and examining the budget and through the actions of the Appropriations Committee we have stopped the Government pay train which, during the past 14 years, has been speeded up by the philosophy of "spend and spend and tax and tax," till it might be illustrated as reaching a speed of 100 miles an hour.

We have stopped the train. We have turned it around. We have headed it back toward sanity in government, toward relief for the taxpayers and in the hope of putting the Government on a sound financial basis which is so important to the future of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a little disappointed to find the members of the Administration criticizing the efforts of the Republican majority and constantly throwing in our way every possible obstruction. This is a great day for the American people and we must repeat our actions and efforts on every Appropriation bill as it comes to the floor of the House. Savings have been written into this bill which in the ultimate will doubtless amount to a little less than a billion dollars. Certainly we should have the support and cooperation of our Democratic friends because their constituents are being benefited by our actions and because their constituents want to reduce the cost of Government just as do the constituents of us Republicans. These reductions will shake about 25,000 people off the Government pay rolls. I know the people will be glad to hear this, and will applaud our efforts.

With the tremendous Federal debt hanging over the people, which amounts

to \$2,000 for every man, woman and child in America, we cannot keep this Government solvent unless we cut every unnecessary governmental expense out of all appropriation bills. That is the program of the Republicans who now hold the majority in this House.

We will continue to do our best to reduce Government expense and we hope in the future that we shall have the full cooperation of the minority party in the House in the interest of all of the taxpayers of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other act shall be used during the fiscal year 1948 for the purchase, within the continental limits of the United States, of any standard typewriting machines (except bookkeeping, billing, and electric machines) at a price in excess of the following for models with carriages which will accommodate paper of the following widths, to wit: Ten inches (correspondence models), \$77; 12 inches, \$82.50; 14 inches, \$85.25; 16 inches, \$90.75; 18 inches, \$96.25; 20 inches, \$103.40; 22 inches, \$104.50; 24 inches, \$107.25; 26 inches, \$113.85; 28 inches, \$114.40; 30 inches, \$115.50; 32 inches, \$118.25; or, for standard typewriting machines distinctively quiet in operation, the maximum prices shall be as follows for models with carriages which will accommodate paper of the following widths, to wit: Ten inches, \$88; 12 inches, \$93.50; 14 inches, \$99; 18 inches, \$104.50: *Provided*, That there may be added to such prices the amount of Federal excise taxes paid or payable with respect to any such machines.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: On page 23, line 18, strike out line 18 to line 12 on page 24, inclusive.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday during general debate on this appropriation bill, if I can have the attention of my colleagues for a few minutes I think you will agree with me that this language placing a ceiling on the price the Government can pay for typewriters is unfair, unreasonable, and not in the public interest. This amendment involves a matter of principle, right or wrong.

This proposition has an interesting history. In 1913 the Secretary of the Treasury through the General Supply Committee invited every manufacturer of typewriters to submit prices for which they would sell typewriters to the Government. Several manufacturers submitted bids each thinking that the low bidder would receive a contract to supply the full needs of the Government.

No such contract was awarded but the next year the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the Treasury and Post Office supply bill wrote language into their bill requiring the Supply Committee to pay no more than the low exclusive bid of the previous year.

That procedure was followed until 1922 when Congress through this same

appropriation bill wrote into the law a price ceiling of \$70 on standard typewriters. Last year the ceiling was raised to \$77 which incidentally was a smaller increase than OPA had just approved for the typewriter industry. Just think for a minute about how much the cost of manufacturing a typewriter has increased since 1922 and how much better the machine of today is than those old machines.

In 1941, for example, the 10-inch standard typewriter sold for \$115.50. As of a few months ago, the same model sold for \$148.50. The question that plagues me is why this method of purchasing is limited to typewriters. There are no ceilings on the price the Government will pay for adding machines, calculators, or even for electric typewriters.

It is indicated in the hearings on this bill that we will need from 40,000 to 50,000 typewriters this year. No manufacturer likes to refuse to sell to his Government but some are being forced to do just that. The Royal Typewriter Co., for example, has refused to sell at this proposed ceiling. The L. C. Smith-Corona Typewriter Co. will supply but 500; Remington-Rand only 3,000. Underwood's limit is 5,000. The Royal Typewriter Co. makes nothing but typewriters. They cannot make up their loss on sales to the Government on some other product.

If I were to offer an amendment placing a price ceiling of \$50 on adding machines or some other piece of office equipment, it would not have the support of half a dozen Members of this House. If I tried by amendment to limit the amount we would pay for telephone toll calls to say 50 percent of the listed charge, no one of you would support such an amendment. This proposed ceiling of \$77 on a standard typewriter cannot be justified. Oh, yes, the Treasury Department likes this ceiling. So does the Budget Bureau, but they do not justify it in the hearings.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to my friend and colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that this constitutes a kind of OPA price ceiling on typewriters?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is a bad form of price control. The gentleman is correct. I am sorry to see it in the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What justification for this limitation has been advanced by members of the committee?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I assume the committee will attempt to justify it on the floor, but I call your attention to the hearings, pages 861 to 876. There is no justification whatsoever.

Mr. COOLEY. Do they undertake to place price ceilings on any other article?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No. Electric typewriters, adding machines, paper clips, and everything else bought by the Government are not under any price ceiling. This not only applies to the Treasury Department but this limi-

tation or ceiling applies to every agency of the Government.

Mr. COOLEY. It has been suggested that this provision has been in the bill for 20 years. Of course, that still does not make it right.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I will be glad to insert the history of it in the RECORD. I inserted it in the RECORD yesterday.

I notice on page 874 of these hearings that there was an off-the-record discussion on this subject. Why the secrecy? It cannot be a military secret today. Previously the typewriter industry has been told that this matter of price ceilings would be looked into before another bill was brought into the House. I submit that in all fairness, we should strike out this language today and then investigate. If any reasonable justification for this ceiling can be produced, it will have the support of the House, I am sure. The industry has held the bag all these years. They rate favorable consideration today.

I deeply appreciate the assurance given the House yesterday by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, that his committee would investigate the cost of manufacturing typewriters and that they would try to work out a satisfactory solution. But again, why limit this procedure to typewriters? If we are going to adopt the policy of finding out the manufacturing cost of every item purchased by the Federal Government from paper clips to battleships, I will have nothing more to say about typewriter prices.

In closing, may I again urge my colleagues to change this amendment on the record disclosed in the hearings found on pages 861 to 875. I understand that the language I wish to strike from this bill is subject to a point of order. Rather than make the point of order, I submit this proposition to the judgment of the House, confident that you will act in the public interest by adopting this amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that most of the companies are now operating under a consent decree issued by the courts?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes; but the consent decree has nothing whatsoever to do with the proposition. The gentleman mentioned that last evening and I inquired about it. The consent decree was issued by a court in New York State. It simply prohibits them from getting together and agreeing on a price at which they will sell typewriters. It forbids them to do the very thing this law makes mandatory that they do in furnishing the Government, and a distinguished Member of this Congress said on the record that we were compelling them to commit what would otherwise be a violation of the antitrust laws.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there any reason that the Government made clear that they should not buy typewriters in the same

manner and follow the same procedure as is followed in the acquisition of any other property?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No reason whatsoever that I can find out; and I repeat here that there can be no good reason.

Mr. COOLEY. The report indicates that the committee said they would make an investigation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They have promised that every year since I first came to Congress, in 1939—and that is not a reflection on any member of the present committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Has an investigation been made?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If it has, no report has been made. I again call attention to the hearings.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. In all fairness, will not the gentleman admit that this is the second year that there has been an investigation?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No; I can show the gentleman on the record that I have taken this up with the Appropriations Committee ever since I first came here in 1939. For many years they have had this arbitrary figure of \$70, but in 1946 it was stricken out in a body I cannot mention. I wish to read one paragraph from a letter I have.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. In this particular instance it is a matter of long custom that we are up against.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I certainly think so. But my time is running out, and I should like to read one paragraph from a letter written by the vice president of one of the typewriter companies to a distinguished member of a legislative body:

The low legislated Government price is well known to the buyers of typewriters, and in their minds it represents a well-considered governmental declaration of what the price of typewriters should be. This has presented a serious problem in dealing with foreign governments, who use every effort to secure the price which the United States Government implies is the value of American-made typewriters. This demand has become more insistent since the introduction of lend-lease.

Incidentally, this letter was written a year ago.

The same demands, based on the same reasons, have been made by various States. One State has been considering the adoption of a regulation similar to that of the United States Government. Several years ago five States combined in an attempt to force the typewriter companies to accord them the price the United States Government fixes as the highest which should be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes and that at the end of that time debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do close.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, are there other Members who wish to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. CANFIELD. I have seen no indication of it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to propound an inquiry to the gentleman from Connecticut as to whether or not he has or will offer an amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have offered an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for an additional 5 minutes and that at the end of that time all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do close.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this is a speech I do not like to make.

As far as this appropriation bill is concerned, the subcommittee has been subject to more pressure from the typewriter lobby than from any other group—or any of the agencies which received a reduced appropriation. They have approached us with high-priced lawyers, and threatened boycotts, so that they could raise the price of typewriters sold to the Government more than \$40 per machine. These lobbyists have phoned my office frequently and persistently. They have appeared in person to try to influence me to have this provision stricken from the bill.

All this they have done despite the fact that the subcommittee, for the first time in many years, if not in history, gave them an opportunity to appear before the committee, and to present their statements for the record.

Except for one company, which mentioned the \$40 per machine increase, the other companies refused to tell us how much the prices would rise. Nevertheless, on the basis of requests from the agencies it can be safely estimated that removing this restriction would result in a minimum increase of \$160,000 per year, and this is a most conservative figure.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman say that those who appeared before his committee and testified are not officials of the company but local salesmen and sales managers. May I say that I have not had a single call from any official of the two large typewriter companies in my district. I had to go to the salesmen in the district for information.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am glad to hear that the gentleman from Connecticut has not been importuned the way the chairman of the subcommittee has been.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Not once.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether these typewriter lobbyists are registered or not?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not know.

The committee could not get the evidence it desired to prove that any new typewriters at all were necessary. We have received reports that thousands of typewriters are right now stockpiled throughout the Government agencies, and that used but usable machines are available in Government warehouses for any agency that desires them. The typewriter people could not present figures to show how many machines the Government had bought in recent years. They would not tell us their costs. The Federal agencies could not tell us how many typewriters had been purchased. The committee was asked by the typewriter companies, pressure was exerted by the typewriter lobby, to force the committee to act without sufficient knowledge, to remove this section without full and complete investigation.

Why are the companies so anxious to have this price ceiling removed? What are their motives and their objectives? Why are they not willing to have the investigative staff of the Appropriations Committee make a study and report back? Why is action demanded now, after more than 20 years of silence and acquiescence?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The fact that this provision has been contained in the bill for the past 20 years does not appeal to me as a justification. Will the gentleman as chairman in charge of the bill give the House some sound reason why this amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut should not be adopted and why this apparent discrimination should be allowed to continue?

Mr. CANFIELD. I shall discuss this. Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Does the gentleman from New Jersey, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, have any idea of what the cost of production of these typewriters is and what the percentage of profit is?

Mr. CANFIELD. I have no idea. Our committee is going to try to get those figures.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Did the gentleman get any idea from interviewing these people representing the typewriter industry how much in their opinion it would cost the Government to buy individual typewriters?

Mr. CANFIELD. For the most part they were not helpful in that respect.

The committee has attempted to reach the facts. We interviewed representatives of all the companies who wished to appear. We had before us representatives of the Federal Bureau of Supply. And we came to the conclusion that here was an instance which must be subjected to the floodlights of official scrutiny, on which true and complete facts should be in the hands of the committee. We do have evidence that the Government can secure sufficient typewriters at the present price to supply its needs for fiscal 1948. We can assure the House that we will have the desired report from the in-

vestigating staff before the next bill for this purpose is presented to Congress.

You will note on page 865 of the hearings that if this section is stricken, the typewriter lobby has already prepared a sales talk to convince government purchasing agents that all typewriters now used by the Federal Government should be replaced. It is easy to determine that this law, in restricting the number of typewriters the manufacturers sell to the Government, forces the Government to make the greatest possible use out of the machines it has at present.

In conclusion, let me quote the statement appearing on page 872 of the hearings, made to the committee by Mr. William Freeman, deputy director in charge of Purchase Branch of the Federal Bureau of Supply:

We feel that a limitation, such as has existed on typewriters—not necessarily at the existing price but a limitation—should continue to exist, and if an increase in that limitation should be considered, that the companies should be forced to show their costs, to prove that the price increase, whatever it might be, would be justified to allow for a reasonable profit, but not an excessive one, in relation to the probable cost to do government business. We believe that from prewar records and studies we can ascertain the number of typewriters involved of all kinds would be between 40,000 and 50,000 a year.

That, gentlemen, is the chief purchasing officer of our Government. His figures can be relied on. Even his minimum figure would mean that removal of this section would result in an additional cost of \$168,000 per year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can the gentleman inform us as to whether or not, in the testimony taken before the subcommittee, the representatives of manufacturers indicated that they intended or would be willing to sell or would demand a price of the Government as high as they are demanding of private purchasers?

Mr. CANFIELD. Some of them indicated that they would allow a discount price similar to that allowed schools throughout the country.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If the Government were to request bids, could not the seven companies submit bids and could not typewriters be purchased on the basis of the lowest bid?

Mr. CANFIELD. The Purchasing Officer of the Federal Government is opposed to that practice at this time.

I quote further from Mr. Freeman's testimony:

From the purchase standpoint we feel that it would be beneficial to have a limitation. I do not believe that any one typewriter company, from what they have told me, would be interested in having all the Government business. I do not know that it would be a good idea to change the type of limitation. The limitation has worked out well from a practical standpoint.

Mr. LeFevre, Assistant to the Deputy Director in Charge of Purchases, made this statement:

It is the view of this Bureau that a retention of a price limitation on typewriting machines is desirable. The ordinary system of competitive bidding would not by itself assure the Government a fair price. The preference for the make of typewriter on which the user is trained, an attitude fostered by the manufacturers, makes it unsound for the Federal Government to attempt to have its needs met by any one or two of the producers. * * *

It is the opinion of the Bureau of Federal Supply that the present method of fixing the maximum price of typewriters by statutes annually reviewed should be continued. * * *

It is contended by the manufacturers that the cost of sales to Government is no less than commercial sales. It should be borne in mind, however, that sales to the Government are without credit risk, advertising expense, collection cost, etc.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. To come back to the question raised by the gentleman from North Carolina, what would stop these typewriter companies from getting together to fix a price at which they would sell their product to the Government? Furthermore, is it not reasonable to assume that as long as there is no pressure behind these typewriter companies to sell their products that they are selling them at a profit to the Government at this time?

Mr. CANFIELD. They want the Government's business, do not have any doubt about that, and we have now, may I say to the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Montana, a qualified staff. We have some expert men to go into this situation fully and completely. A request has been made for that investigation by the subcommittee, and it is in progress now.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman did not answer the question asked by the gentleman from Montana. The answer should be, of course, that the typewriter manufacturers could not get together in violation of the antitrust laws any more than the manufacturers of any other article. Now, it seems to me that the principle involved in this case is entirely wrong. If you are going to apply this principle to typewriters, why not apply it to automobiles and to every other article purchased by the Government?

Mr. CANFIELD. We do apply it to automobiles. The gentleman happens to mention an item that we do apply it to. It is applied to automobiles by statute now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut) there were—ayes 11, noes 92. So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay and allowances: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers, cadets, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted personnel, active and retired, temporary cooks, surfmen, substitute surfmen, and six civilian instructors; retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service authorized by the act approved April 14, 1930 (14 U. S. C. 178a); not exceeding \$10,000 for cash prizes for men for excellence in boatmanship, gunnery, target practice, and engineering competitions; transportation of dependents of Coast Guard personnel on active duty and retired and Reserve officers and of retired and Reserve enlisted personnel, of grades entitled to transportation of dependents in the Regular Coast Guard, when ordered to active duty (other than training) and upon relief therefrom; carrying out the provisions of the act of June 4, 1920 (34 U. S. C. 943); not to exceed \$20,000 for cost of special instruction, including books, laboratory equipment and fees, school supplies, and maintenance of students; motion-picture and other equipment for instructional purposes; rations or commutation thereof for cadets, petty officers, other enlisted personnel, and members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary when assigned specific duties under the provisions of section 8, act of February 19, 1941, as amended (14 U. S. C. 267), mileage and expenses allowed by law for officers, including per diem rates of allowance, and the Secretary is hereby authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance for Public Health Service officers detailed to the Coast Guard as authorized for Coast Guard officers; actual and necessary expenses or per diem in lieu thereof as the Secretary may determine and approve for Coast Guard personnel on special duty in foreign countries; traveling expenses of other persons traveling on duty under orders from the Treasury Department, including transportation of cadets, enlisted personnel, and applicants for enlistment, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation in kind and subsistence to discharged cadets; uniform clothing for enlisted men as provided by law (14 U. S. C. 13); clothing for enlisted personnel authorized by law; civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed \$30 per person to enlisted personnel given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unsuitability, or inaptitude; reimbursement in kind or in cash as authorized by law to persons in the Coast Guard for personal property lost, destroyed, or damaged; actual expenses of officers and cadets and quarters and subsistence of enlisted personnel on shore patrol, emergency shore detail, and other detached duty, or cash in lieu thereof; hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where sufficient quarters are not possessed by the United States to accommodate them; hire of quarters for Coast Guard personnel comparable to quarters assignable on a capital ship of the Navy, as authorized by the Secretary to meet emergency conditions, including officers and men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable: *Provided*, That under this authorization no funds may be expended for the hire of quarters for occupancy by the dependents of officers or enlisted personnel; expenses of recruiting for the Coast Guard; advertising for and obtaining enlisted personnel and applicants for appointment as cadets; training of enlisted personnel, including textbooks, school supplies, and correspondence courses; transfer of household goods and effects of Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve personnel on active duty and when ordered to active duty and upon relief therefrom, and the transfer of household goods and effects of deceased Coast Guard

and Coast Guard Reserve personnel who die while on active duty, as prescribed by law and regulations; transportation on Government-owned vessels of privately owned automobiles of Coast Guard personnel upon change of station; purchase of provisions for sale to Coast Guard personnel at isolated stations, and the appropriation reimbursed; and including not to exceed \$50,000 for recreation, amusement, comfort, contentment, and health of the enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard, to be expended pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary; apprehension and delivery of deserters and stragglers; in all, not to exceed \$70,000,000: *Provided*, That money accruing from commutation of rations of enlisted personnel commuted for the benefit of any mess may be paid on proper voucher to the officer in charge of such mess: *Provided further*, That whenever commissioned officers of the Coast Guard, who were civilian employees of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, resume their status as civilian employees of the Coast Guard, or whenever civilian employees of the Coast Guard, who were employed in the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, are commissioned as officers of the Coast Guard, the limitation provided for "civilian employees, Coast Guard" may be exceeded, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, by the amount of their pay as civilian employees and the limitation for "pay and allowances" reduced in a like amount or vice versa, as the case may be.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, within the next few days we will listen to a great deal of talk on the subject of stopping communism in Greece and the Mediterranean area. While we shout about the advance of communism abroad the New Deal executive departments are apparently immune to what is going on within those agencies.

Mr. Chairman, I was much surprised when I read part of the hearings on the Treasury Department appropriation bill for 1948. I refer to page 261 of the hearings, where a discussion was held between the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], chairman of the subcommittee which has this bill for consideration, and a Mr. Jordan who is a member of the Treasury committee which has the responsibility for investigating un-American allegiances in the Treasury Department. I refer now to page 261 and will quote the testimony of Mr. CANFIELD and Mr. Jordan:

Mr. CANFIELD. What steps are being taken to check against persons with un-American allegiances obtaining and retaining employment in the Treasury?

Mr. JORDAN. The Treasury Department has a committee headed—

Mr. CANFIELD. You are chairman of that committee, are you?

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. T. F. Wilson.

Mr. CANFIELD. You are a member of the Treasury committee?

Mr. JORDAN. The Treasury committee that has been functioning for the last 4 years, consisted of the Director of Personnel, the general counsel, and a representative from the bureau in which the employee was located.

Mr. CANFIELD. Are you the chairman of that committee in the Treasury?

Mr. JORDAN. The Director of Personnel is.

Mr. CANFIELD. How thorough is your work? For instance, how many persons have you discharged from the Treasury for un-American activities? We want you to elaborate on that a little bit. The Secretary the other day stressed it, and I want you to tell us what the Treasury is doing about that.

Mr. JORDAN. I would have to check to see how many we have discharged over a period of time. Our whole procedure is undergoing change.

Mr. Chairman, subsequently the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] projected himself into the examination of Mr. Jordan and on this same page, 261, he said:

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Jordan, going back a little to this Loyalty Committee that has been established by Executive order of the President, I understand you have designated on the committee by the Secretary of the Treasury. Isn't that the way it works?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes, I am a member of the Treasury Department Committee; Assistant Secretary Foley is a member of the President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But what are the functions of that Loyalty Committee, and what are the admonitions and injunctions they operate under? What is your duty as you see it under such Executive order.

Mr. JORDAN. Under Executive Order No. 9300 of February 5, 1943, there was an interdepartmental committee set up that was to act in an advisory capacity to the Department. That committee established certain rules that the Department must follow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is there a copy of the rules available?

Mr. JORDAN. I could get them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Insert them in the hearings, if you please, in connection with your remarks.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes, sir.

Continuing, Mr. Chairman, on page 267, and again the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is questioning:

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us get back to the Executive order.

What did the loyalty committee do by way of setting up rules and regulations? You must have adopted certain standards, didn't you?

Mr. JORDAN. The standards were adopted for us by the interdepartmental committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Could you tell me in a general way just what those standards are?

Mr. JORDAN. The main requirement was that a person must be given an oral hearing. In our experience with that requirement, we have found that we could not convict anybody on an oral hearing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Tell us a little about that. Were you a member of this hearing?

Mr. JORDAN. We had this character investigation report, and in that report some people who testified against the individual were named, and others were not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How did the individuals' names get to you in the first place? Did you get them by letter, information, was it in a subrosa fashion, or how did you get the information?

Mr. JORDAN. Character investigations, principally, or if the person was in a position where a character investigation was not required, he might be picked up by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How many names were certified to you by the Treasury?

Mr. JORDAN. I would have to guess at that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would you guess at it, please, and correct it later for the record?

Mr. JORDAN. My guess would be about 352. (EDITOR'S NOTE.—The number of cases given in the original testimony was 125, which was found to be incorrect.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. There were 352 names submitted to you, who were charged with possible disloyalty, or there was an allegation that they may have been guilty of disloyalty? Is that correct?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will you proceed from there, please?

Mr. JORDAN. Early in this new procedure, the committee found it was necessary to hold a hearing in a case. However, this was our experience. The man was given ample opportunity to state his case. He could bring in all the witnesses that he wished, but we could not get any witnesses against him.

Oftentimes the witnesses indicated to the investigator that they would not want their names mentioned, or, if we did have their names, by the time we got the case they may have been transferred out of the Washington area. So the procedure didn't work. We could not convict a man unless we could get testimony against him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How many of those hearings did you actually hold?

Mr. JORDAN. We actually held one.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just one?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Out of 352 cases?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes; and we attempted to hold another one, but were unable to get the case to the point of actual hearing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When was the last hearing?

Mr. JORDAN. This one case was during 1943. The hearing was held on November 1, 1943, after the Executive order was issued.

Mr. CANFIELD. Has anyone ever been discharged from the Treasury Department for disloyalty as a result of the investigation?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes; a few have.

Mr. CANFIELD. How many?

Mr. JORDAN. One person admitted that she was a Communist and we discharged her. A few people have been discharged because of information received during the trial period when we didn't have to submit it to this committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What happened to those cases that were given to you on which you had no hearings?

Mr. JORDAN. The committee felt that on many of them the information was no good, and there was nothing against them. Therefore the employee was given a clean bill of health.

On others there may have been some doubt, but in view of the fact that we could not get any specific information with which we could charge the individual, nothing was done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the matter is thoroughly dormant now? In other words, no action was taken; is that correct?

Mr. JORDAN. No; it is not dormant now. The Secretary has reopened this matter in the last 2 or 3 months, and has appointed Assistant Secretary Foley to go fully into this whole picture, to work with the temporary commission that the President appointed not very long ago, to review this whole procedural situation.

I may say that our great difficulty has been a procedural one. If we follow court rules in the Department we could not get convictions.

In our attempts to handle this situation, in ferreting out these people, we must try to protect the Government and to do justice to people who merely are liberal-minded, but who have no communistic sympathies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to point out here that nobody has been harmed by the injustices which may have been done, but I am equally determined that the situation must be met in Government.

If it is a question of hearsay, we must determine what procedure shall be followed—one which is fair, equitable, and unemotional.

Mr. Chairman, I was utterly amazed, and I am sure that Members of the House have been amazed, as I read the colloquy between Mr. Jordan and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] regarding the effort or lack of it that was made against the 352 people who were charged with subversive activities within the Treasury Department; the confession on

the part of Mr. Jordan that only 1 case out of the 352 was actually pressed to the dismissal standpoint from 1943 until the present time. What a weak position on the part of the Treasury Department, when Mr. Jordan admits that the Secretary of the Treasury only within the last 2 or 3 months has again renewed an effort to meet the charges of communism within his Department. The responsibility, Mr. Chairman, rests with the Secretary of the Treasury, and nobody else. He cannot pass the buck.

Mr. Chairman, here we have the perfect example by New Deal executive agencies of temporizing and appeasing those who are charged with subversive activities in the governmental service. It is a situation that must be condemned by every Member of this House who has any interest in the perpetuation of his own Government.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will follow through and ascertain what effort, if any, is being taken to eliminate subversive activities within the Treasury Department. It has a responsibility to the public also and should be the first to speak out and condemn the practice presently indulged in by that Department.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1948."

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise in support of this bill, H. R. 2436. Voting to cut a recommended appropriation is neither easy nor politically pleasant.

The Coast Guard means more to me personally perhaps than it does to other Members of this House. The Coast Guard Academy is located in my district. I know many of its staff well. I have great respect for the fine job being done there by Admiral Pine, Captain Olson, and the other officers of the Academy. I know of their work from personal observation.

I have a close family tie with the Coast Guard. I saw and know of the fine work done by this organization during the war.

Now that the war is over—and pray God it is over—we must go forward to a peacetime economy. Economy is more than just preaching—it is something we must practice.

A tax-conscious Nation demands more than talk. It demands that every department of the Government practice the same economy required of you and myself as individuals.

By our action today we may be suggesting to certain other departments of the Government that they can no longer "pass the buck" or load up to the Coast Guard.

In the future all of us may well be expected to do more with less. I am confident that the Coast Guard joins in the acceptance of that challenge.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I was very much surprised to read in the Rec-

ORD of yesterday criticism of the operation of Ioran and other aids to navigation by the Coast Guard and the weather stations on the Atlantic. I understand those things are matters of international agreement and the Coast Guard is committed to continue to operate these aids to navigation. The appropriation for those should not be cut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I am of the opinion that the Coast Guard is not committed to the operation of all of them. It is being willed on them. There is some question as to what agency is going to be responsible in the future for the continuation of the operation of Ioran. I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but I believe I am correctly informed on that particular point.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the preceding gentleman in defending that great body which has rendered such outstanding service not only in time of peace but in time of war to the people of America, the Coast Guard.

I was surprised yesterday at something the gentleman from New Jersey said, although I admire the gentleman very much—he is a personal friend—and I am sure he did not mean what he said. His words are in the RECORD. I read the words:

Some of my colleagues will, a little later, give you specific examples of the waste, extravagance, and grandiose schemes of the Coast Guard.

Gentlemen, here is one of the oldest services in America, one that has written history up and down the coast line of America on the Atlantic and the Pacific, a service which, when war approached us, sprang to the defense of our country. They were prepared and had trained men, as well as training others. They landed the greater part of our troops on the islands of the Pacific. They manned the boats that carried the soldiers and sailors and marines from the transports. They contributed greatly to our glorious victories in the Pacific.

I noticed with interest, also, in the Star of yesterday afternoon the remarks of my dear friend, "that the party was now on the beam as far as economy goes." The gentleman from Illinois, I am sure, read that himself. It is a strange thing when the ax of economy falls, we find whose neck is caught under the ax. Here is a great agency of the Government which does not have the arm to reach out and defend itself in the halls of Congress as other Government agencies have. Neither do they try to walk up and down the halls in the lobby of the House Office Building and defend themselves as some other agencies do. Yet, in this bill they caught the ax harder on a percentage basis than any other agency that has been cut or probably will be cut.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I certainly yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want my friend the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, to know that the words he just quoted which were the words I ut-

tered yesterday were well thought out and well measured. Yes, I used the adjective "grandiose," and the Bureau of the Budget could have used the same word when they cut the Coast Guard estimates \$49,000,000 after a \$50,000,000 cut by the Treasury before they went to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BONNER. But, certainly, I think it was an injustice to use the word "scheming." There was no scheming because this agency is just as interested in performing its duties as any other agency. If they overstep in their endeavor to greatly expand their duty of life saving, aid to navigation, both in the air and on sea and try to reach out and get too much, that is another thing, but certainly the word "scheming" is unjust. Nevertheless, I will pass over that, for I am certain it is not true.

On page 1884 of the RECORD of yesterday there was a discussion between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS] and myself based on a criticism heaped on the Coast Guard with respect to this training program. All of us who were here at the beginning of the war know that during the early stages of the war the Coast Guard trained men for the merchant marine. They trained them successfully and made them ready to perform their duties in the interest of the national defense. Yet, there appeared in the picture a program to separate the training that had been established by the Coast Guard and which was being carried out with credit and perfection. This effort was successful and now we have a dual training program for men of practically the same type, Coast Guard and merchant marine, with a Merchant Marine Academy. This should have been carried on by the Coast Guard, who were prepared to do the training and who were doing the training well at that time. I think the present chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will bear out what I say.

As for economy performed in this bill, remember that we may yet live to rue the day that we performed such economy. Whatever may be done here nothing can take from the record the glorious performance and unselfish sacrifices of this service, both in time of peace, war, and disaster, both on sea and land. North Carolina, Mr. Chairman, has furnished some of the most outstanding men in this service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Committee of the Whole that we are not wanting in devotion to a very fine service, known as the Coast Guard, but when the chairman of the subcommittee selected the word "grandiose," I think it was very properly applied. One need only look at the testimony and look at the figures to understand that the word bears very close application. It was intended to convey the idea of a much-expanded service.

For instance, in 1940 the Coast Guard had 3 rear admirals. In 1948 they are asking for 18 rear admirals—six times as

many as we had in the last prewar, peacetime year.

In 1940 the Coast Guard had 33 captains. When they came before our committee for the fiscal year 1948 they asked for 114, which is nearly three times as many captains.

In 1940 they had 69 commanders. They come now and ask us for 205 commanders. Would you not say that the adjective "grandiose" is rather properly applied when an agency reaches out for that kind of an expansion program?

Now, that is not all. I said to the admiral and to his budget officer, "How much did you ask your own budget committee for in the Treasury Department for the next fiscal year?" He said, "\$231,749,000." Mind you, in 1940 they had \$26,000,000, in the last peacetime year. Now they were requesting \$231,000,000 from their own budget officer. So what happened? Before they even emerged from their own department of government they had been cut \$60,000,000. Then they had to come before the President's Budget Bureau. What happened there? They cut them another \$39,000,000. Ninety-nine million dollars was cut out of the Coast Guard before the bill ever landed in the bosom of the subcommittee. You talk about fat in the Government budget today. Why, they recognize it in the budget bureaus of every department. Otherwise they could not cut out 70 percent of that appropriation before it even landed in the subcommittee.

I said to Admiral Farley and Captain Richmond, "If we Members of Congress should delete another \$50,000,000, we would be criticized and vilified and calumniated." If I had my way, we would have cut out \$50,000,000, but I had to compromise on that item. What we have got to determine is this: Is it going to be one of these expansive agencies to work all over the world, or is it going to be a coast guard? They appeared before us in civilian attire. It is considered a civilian agency, but its program makes it appear as an auxiliary navy. I want to know whether it is a coast guard or whether it is a miniature navy. If it is going to be navy, then let the Navy take care of them. If it is a coast guard, it has no business running Ioran stations out in Guam and away up in Alaska and all over the blue water of the seven seas.

They had \$26,000,000 in 1940 and they ask for \$231,000,000 in 1948. We cut them down substantially.

One other item. Make no mistake about this. The things they asked for next fiscal year is going to be the base for the future. Let me prove it to you. I said to Captain Richmond, "For budget purposes 1948 will be sort of a base year, and you will go forward from that year, not backward." He said, "That is correct."

"In other words, it will be your base year," and he said, "Yes, sir."

You see, 1948 if they could have contrived \$231,000,000, that would have been the springboard for the future. Then I said: "Captain Richmond, if every agency of government will do that there will not be enough money in the United States of America if we hock everything

of value in order to meet the demands of the Government agencies."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I take it that the amount they were asking was greater than what we spent on the entire Navy in 1932, was it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not go quite that far.

Mr. DINGELL. Pretty nearly that much.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it was a very substantial amount and I can remember the time when the appropriations for the Navy Department did not amount to much more than \$230,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois who did want to cut the Coast Guard \$50,000,000 will be willing to admit that he had to scrap a lot with the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. I think my colleagues on the subcommittee were filled with generosity when they marked up this bill.

I say that after everything has been said and done we have contrived a splendid bill with sufficient funds for every agency to properly express its proper functions and serve the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural delivery service: For pay of rural carriers, auxiliary carriers, substitutes for rural carriers on annual and sick leave, clerks in charge of rural stations, tolls and ferrage, and necessary expenses of the rural delivery service, \$129,167,000, of which not less than \$200,000 shall be available for extensions and new service.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I join other members representing rural districts in regretting that a reduction of \$200,000 has been made in the budget estimates for rural free delivery. There is a demand and there is a need for additional rural routes in practically every agricultural section of our country. This reduction in appropriations means the elimination of 150 additional carriers on 150 new rural routes. This means that many farmers at the end of the road will not have free mail delivery service.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer is as much entitled to this service as any resident of any city in the United States. When our country was at war and our very survival was at stake, we did not pass up the man who lives at the fork of the creek. We sent his sons into every bat-

tlefield in the world. Are we now going to decline to deliver his mail because he happens to live a little too far from the post office? This is not only false economy; it is, in my opinion, a breach of our duty to our farmer citizens. I grew up on a rural route and I know what this service means to the farmer. While we are worrying about every foreign nation on earth, I for one am going to insist on the development and extension of our rural free delivery service and our farm-to-market road program until every farmer in America has his mail delivered to his front gate.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2436) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—389

Abernethy	Bolton	Clements
Albert	Bonner	Clevenger
Allen, Calif.	Boykin	Clippinger
Allen, Ill.	Bradley, Calif.	Coffin
Allen, La.	Bradley, Mich.	Cole, Kans.
Almond	Bramblett	Cole, Mo.
Andersen	Brehm	Colmer
H. Carl	Brooks	Combs
Anderson, Calif.	Brophy	Cooley
Andresen	Brown, Ga.	Cooper
August H.	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
Andrews, Ala.	Bryson	Cotton
Andrews, N. Y.	Buchanan	Coudert
Angell	Buck	Cox
Arends	Buffett	Crawford
Arnold	Burke	Crosser
Auchincloss	Burleson	Crow
Bakewell	Busbey	Cunningham
Banta	Butler	Curtis
Barrett	Byrne, N. Y.	Dague
Bates, Ky.	Byrnes, Wis.	D'Alesandro
Bates, Mass.	Camp	Davis, Ga.
Battle	Canfield	Davis, Tenn.
Beckworth	Cannon	Dawson, Utah
Bell	Carroll	Deane
Bender	Case, N. J.	Delaney
Bennett, Mich.	Case, S. Dak.	Devitt
Bennett, Mo.	Chadwick	D'Ewart
Bishop	Chelf	Dingell
Blackney	Chenoweth	Dirksen
Bland	Chipperfield	Dolliver
Blatnik	Church	Domengeaux
Boggs, Del.	Clason	Dondero
Boggs, La.		Donohue

Dorn	Judd	Price, Fla.
Doughton	Karsten, Mo.	Price, Ill.
Douglas	Kean	Priest
Drewry	Kearney	Rabin
Durham	Kearns	Rains
Eaton	Keating	Ramey
Eberharter	Kee	Rankin
Elliott	Keefe	Rayburn
Ellis	Kefauver	Rayfiel
Ellsworth	Kennedy	Redden
Elsaesser	Kerr	Reed, Ill.
Elston	Kersten, Wis.	Reed, N. Y.
Engel, Mich.	Kilburn	Reeves
Engle, Calif.	Kilday	Rich
Fallon	King	Richards
Fenton	Kirwan	Riehlman
Fernandez	Klein	Riley
Fisher	Kunkel	Rivers
Flannagan	Landis	Rizley
Fletcher	Lane	Robertson
Fogarty	Lanham	Robison
Folger	Latham	Rockwell
Foot	Lea	Rogers, Fla.
Forand	LeCompte	Rogers, Mass.
Fulton	Lemke	Rohrbough
Gamble	Lewis	Rooney
Gary	Lodge	Ross
Gathings	Love	Russell
Gavin	Lucas	Sabath
Gearhart	Lyle	Sadlak
Gifford	Lynch	Sadowski
Gillette	McConnell	St. George
Gillie	McCormack	Sanborn
Goff	McCowan	Sarbacher
Goodwin	McDonough	Sasser
Gordon	McDowell	Schwabe, Mo.
Gore	McGarvey	Schwabe, Okla.
Gorski	McGregor	Scoblick
Gossett	McMahon	Scott, Hardie
Graham	McMillan, S. C.	Scott
Granger	McMillen, Ill.	Hugh D., Jr.
Grant, Ala.	MacKinnon	Scrivner
Grant, Ind.	Macy	Seely-Brown
Gregory	Madden	Shafer
Griffiths	Mahon	Sheppard
Gross	Maloney	Sikes
Gwinn, N. Y.	Manasco	Simpson, Ill.
Gwynne, Iowa	Mansfield	Simpson, Pa.
Hagen	Mont	Smathers
Hale	Mansfield, Tex.	Smith, Kans.
Hall	Marcantonio	Smith, Maine
Edwin Arthur	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Ohio
Hall	Mason	Smith, Wis.
Leonard W.	Mathews	Snyder
Halleck	Meade, Md.	Somers
Hand	Morrow	Spence
Hardy	Meyer	Springer
Harless, Ariz.	Michener	Stanley
Harris	Miller, Calif.	Stefan
Harrison	Miller, Conn.	Stevenson
Hart	Miller, Md.	Stigler
Havenner	Miller, Nebr.	Stockman
Hays	Mills	Stratton
Hébert	Mitchell	Sundstrom
Hedrick	Monroney	Taber
Hendricks	Morgan	Talle
Herter	Morris	Taylor
Heseltun	Morton	Teague
Hill	Muhlenberg	Thomas, N. J.
Hinshaw	Mundt	Thomas, Tex.
Hobbs	Murdoch	Thomason
Hoeven	Murray, Tenn.	Tibbott
Hoffman	Murray, Wis.	Tollefson
Hollfield	Nodar	Towe
Holmes	Norblad	Trimble
Hope	Norman	Twyman
Horan	O'Brien	Vail
Howell	O'Hara	Van Zandt
Huber	O'Konski	Vinson
Hull	O'Toole	Vorys
Jackson, Calif.	Owens	Vursell
Jackson, Wash.	Pace	Wadsworth
Jarman	Passman	Walter
Javits	Patman	Weichel
Jenison	Patterson	West
Jenkins, Ohio	Peden	Wheeler
Jennings	Peterson	Whitten
Jensen	Philbin	Whittington
Johnson, Calif.	Phillips, Calif.	Williams
Johnson, Ill.	Phillips, Tenn.	Wilson, Ind.
Johnson, Ind.	Pickett	Wilson, Tex.
Johnson, Okla.	Ploeser	Winstead
Johnson, Tex.	Plumley	Wolcott
Jones, Ala.	Poage	Wolverton
Jones, N. C.	Potts	Worley
Jones, Ohio	Poulson	Youngblood
Jones, Wash.	Powell	Zimmerman
Jonkman	Preston	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—43

Barden	Celler	Cravens
Beall	Chapman	Dawson, Ill.
Bloom	Clark	Evins
Buckley	Cole, N. Y.	Feighan
Bulwinkle	Courtney	Fellows

Fuller	Knutson	Pfeifer
Gallagher	Larcade	Rees
Gerlach	LeFevre	Short
Harness, Ind.	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Hartley	Lusk	Welch
Heffernan	Meade, Ky.	Wigglesworth
Hess	Morrison	Wood
Jenkins, Pa.	Nixon	Woodruff
Kelley	Norrell	
Keogh	Norton	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Wigglesworth with Mr. Cravens.
 Mr. Hartley with Mr. Kelley.
 Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pfeifer.
 Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Keogh.
 Mr. LeFevre with Mr. Feighan.
 Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Larcade.
 Mr. Harness of Indiana with Mrs. Norton.
 Mr. Short with Mr. Heffernan.
 Mr. Hess with Mr. Wood.
 Mr. Beall with Mr. Barden.
 Mr. Fellows with Mr. Lesinski.
 Mr. Nixon with Mr. Morrison.
 Mr. Fuller with Mrs. Lusk.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
 Mr. Rees with Mr. Clark.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter from Commissioner Johnson of the customs service.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on Bretton Woods by John Kelley.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON TREASURY-POST OFFICE BILL

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill passed this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on March 10, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1030. An act to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Committee on Banking and Currency will meet at 10 a. m., Wednesday, March 12, 1947, in the committee room, 1301 New House Office Building, to continue its hearings on sugar legislation.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, March 12, 1947.

Business to be considered: Executive session. Conference with officials of the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 o'clock p. m., Wednesday, March 12, 1947.

Business to be considered: Executive session. Conference with officials of the Interior Department, with respect to petroleum conservation, pipe lines, and oil compacts, pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, March 13, 1947.

Business to be considered: Executive session. Conference with officials of the Railroad Retirement Board, the Treasury Department, with respect to the Bureau of Internal Revenue on railroad retirement funds, and the Federal Security Agency with respect to the Social Security Board on railroad retirement funds, pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, March 14, 1947.

Business to be considered: Executive session. Conference with officials of the Department of Commerce, with respect to the Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and the Inland Waterways Corporation, pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, March 18, 1947.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 2109, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; also public hearing on H. R. 2324, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday and Wednesday, March 18 and 19, 1947.

Business to be considered: Public hearings on H. R. 2185, H. R. 2235, and H. R. 2292, to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Subcommittee meeting 10 a. m., Wednesday, March 12, 1947, 213 House Office Building, to consider H. R. 1636, pertaining to rural carriers' leave.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

An executive meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery

floor, the Capitol, on Thursday, March 13, 1947, at 10:30 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 134, providing for relief assistance to countries devastated by war.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Friday, March 14, 1947, at 10 a. m., Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin hearings on the following measures, with respect to war and emergency powers:

H. R. 1983, to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

House Concurrent Resolution 5, to declare the date of termination of the wars in which the United States has been engaged since December 7, 1941.

House Concurrent Resolution 9, to declare December 7, 1946, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in, and as the date of the termination of, the present war.

House Concurrent Resolution 25, to declare the date of termination of the wars in which the United States has been engaged since December 7, 1941.

House Joint Resolution 56, to terminate the emergency war powers of the President.

House Joint Resolution 128, to declare July 4, 1947, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war.

House Concurrent Resolution 21, providing that various titles of the Second War Powers Act of 1942 shall remain in force until the day following the adoption of this resolution.

The hearings will be conducted in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

There will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary on Monday, March 17, 1947, on the following bills:

H. R. 1468, to provide for the review of certain orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Maritime Commission and giving the United States courts of appeals jurisdiction on review to enjoin, set aside, or suspend such orders.

H. R. 1470, to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended.

The hearing will begin at 10:30 a. m., and will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Full committee meeting 10 a. m., Thursday, March 13, 1947, 213 House Office Building, to consider H. R. 2408, postal rates. Open hearings.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Friday, March 14, 1947, at 10 a. m., Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H. R. 120, H. R. 695, and H. R. 1888, to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II. The hearings will be conducted in room 345, House Office Building.

On Wednesday, March 19, 1947, at 10:30 a. m., in room 346, Old House Office Building, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin

hearings on the following measures with respect to holidays and celebrations:

H. R. 147 and H. R. 316, making the 14th day of August in each year a legal holiday, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 1, House Joint Resolution 11, House Joint Resolution 23, House Joint Resolution 41, House Joint Resolution 63, House Joint Resolution 65, and Senate Joint Resolution 41, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

House Joint Resolution 31, providing for the observance of October 11, 1947, as General Pulaski Memorial Day.

House Joint Resolution 12, requesting the President to declare November 10, 1947, a day for the observance of the creation of the United States Marine Corps.

House Joint Resolution 15, designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week.

House Joint Resolution 20, designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading.

House Joint Resolution 35, designating the second Sunday of October of each year as Grandmother's Day.

House Joint Resolution 46, authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775.

House Joint Resolution 60, designating September 17 of each year as Constitution Day.

House Joint Resolution 64, designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day.

House Joint Resolution 82, designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day.

House Joint Resolution 88, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

House Joint Resolution 94, requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

House Joint Resolution 100, designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-In's Day.

H. R. 1051, designating the first Monday of October in each year as National Farm Day and declaring such day a legal public holiday.

H. R. 1193, declaring August 14 of each year a legal holiday.

H. R. 1981, declaring Good Friday in each year a legal holiday.

H. R. 2085, designating the fourth Saturday in September of each year as American Indian Day.

H. R. 2333, declaring the birthday of Abraham Lincoln to be a legal holiday.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

442. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of

the Directory of Electric and Gas Utilities, 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

443. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 involving a decrease of \$35,000 for the Department of Justice, in the form of an amendment to House Document No. 108, Eightieth Congress (H. Doc. No. 169); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

444. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947, involving a decrease of \$155,000 for the Federal Works Agency, in the form of an amendment to House Document No. 106, Eightieth Congress (H. Doc. No. 170); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

445. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting one copy each of a report of the Federal Trade Commission on the copper industry: Part I—The Copper Industry of the United States and International Copper Cartels; and Part II—Concentration and Control by the Three Dominant Companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 138. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1327, a bill to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period; without amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1943, a bill to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 140. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2404, a bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1998. A bill to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to the receiving of stolen property; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GILLETTE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2123. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 326. A bill for the relief of Wilma E. Baker; with amendments (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 360. A bill for the relief of Early O. Hardin; with amendments (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 384. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Rainger, Diane Rosser and Roberta Rosser, W. H. Baker, and Mrs. Katherine D. Wert; with amendments (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 428. A bill for the relief of Charles N. Bemis; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 444. A bill for the relief of the estate of Archie S. Woods, deceased; with amendments (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 620. A bill for the relief of Blanche E. Broad; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 654. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 722. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Clark; with amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 723. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 811. A bill for the relief of J. F. Powers; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 828. A bill for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California; with amendments (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 914. A bill for the relief of George Corenevsky; with amendments (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1064. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Weber; with amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1068. A bill for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser; with amendments (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1092. A bill for the relief of Eugene Spitzer; with amendments (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of Nellie P. Dunn; with amendments (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2094. A bill for the relief of Isaac B. Jones; with amendments (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Banking and Currency was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2473) to authorize the trans-

fer without charge to the States and their political subdivisions of all interest of the United States in educational and recreational facilities acquired under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and the same was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2491. A bill extending certain recognition and rights to temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, including the voluntary port security force and members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2492. A bill to reduce the surtax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 2493. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide additional grades in the case of certain custodial employees at post offices of the first class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 2494. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national soil fertility policy and program; to authorize the construction of certain fertilizer plants as a part of said program; to provide for the testing and demonstrating of fertilizer produced in such Government and cooperative plants on a Nation-wide scale; to provide for the exploration of fertilizer resources on the public lands; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2495. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 2496. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, approved March 3, 1925, as amended, to provide for tests of blood, urine, and breath of persons arrested in the District of Columbia for certain offenses; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2497. A bill to extend the time within which educational institutions may retain possession of temporary housing for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2498. A bill to terminate existing consumer credit regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLEVINGER:

H. R. 2499. A bill to provide an award for arrested tuberculosis cases of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2500. A bill to amend section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875-878, 8 U. S. C. 136); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 2501. A bill to protect Klamath Indian livestock; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2502. A bill to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Olympic games of 1952 be held in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 141. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 142. Resolution to provide for a survey to determine a site for a Federal penal or correctional institution to supplant the Federal penitentiary on Alcatraz Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal loans for scheduled air lines; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to terminate the powers granted to the executive branch of the Government to control the export of foods and agricultural products during the emergency arising from World War II; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2503. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2504. A bill for the relief of Eroeda Sinitskaya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2505. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Coutoulakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 2506. A bill for the relief of Louis T. Klauder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 2508. A bill for the relief of James I. Mathews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2509. A bill for the relief of Buntaro Kumagai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 2510. A bill for the relief of Morris Giannace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSER:

H. R. 2511. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Warren J. Heiney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

179. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Frank R. Anderson and 30 other residents of Spokane,

Wash., expressing their support of House Resolution 81, a resolution calling for the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate radio crime programs which because of their nature and large number might be contributing to delinquency; to the Committee on Rules.

180. By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana: Senate Joint Memorial No. 1, requesting that necessary, sufficient, and proper appropriations be made for the construction, reconstruction, improvement, betterment, and maintenance of the Yellowstone National Park Monument Approach Road, leading from the city of Red Lodge, Mont., to the northeast entrance of the Yellowstone National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

181. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Montana State Legislature, requesting sufficient and proper appropriation to provide for snow removal for winter travel over that portion of the highway in Yellowstone National Park connecting United States Highways Nos. 89 and 191, a distance of 49 miles, from Mammoth Hot Springs to West Yellowstone, Mont.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

182. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of 347 World War II veterans, who are attending the Paris (Tex.) Junior College, urging the passage of legislation increasing the subsistence allowance to veterans of World War II, with or without dependents, attending schools and colleges under the so-called GI bill of rights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

183. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Vergil D. McMillan, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the case of Vergil D. McMillan, plaintiff, against State of Indiana, first defendant, and Mrs. O. J. McMillan, second defendant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 19, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father of the universe, we come to Thee, conscious of our own shortcomings, but with confidence and composure, knowing that having put our trust in Thee, our faith is well founded. May we tolerate nothing in our personal living which, if multiplied, would weaken our Nation. Teach us that our country is no better than its citizens, and no stronger than those in whom it puts its trust. So may we see ourselves as Thou dost see us, that being ashamed we may seek forgiveness, and knowing our weaknesses may accept Thy strength. With Thy blessing upon us, we need not fear decisions, nor hesitate to act. So use us, guide us, and act through us, we ask in Jesus' name and for His sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 10, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.